

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. 104, NO. 18

NEW YORK, MONDAY, MAY 5, 1941

NUMBER 1379

The Battle for Suez

The war in the Mediterranean is apparently approaching a great climax, and the history of the world may be altered by the events of the next few weeks far more than it has been by the campaigns in Yugoslavia and Greece.

People will doubtless debate for decades to come on whether the British, with their very limited resources in the Mediterranean, should have helped the Greeks. The answer seems to be that from a military point of view it was a quixotic adventure, doomed from the beginning to failure unless the Yugoslavs and Turks could have been induced to stand against the Germans—and in time—but that politically it was far otherwise. If the British, to save a few thousand men (fewer than were sometimes killed on a single day in the First World War) had stood aside and left the Greeks to their fate, they would have lost face throughout the world and especially in the dominions and the United States. In a total war military considerations are not the only or the prevailing ones.

In this issue of The New Republic Dr. Max Werner gives his reasons for believing that the Germans will now strike at Suez from both sides but will also try to come down through Northwest Africa to Dakar. From there they could launch an attack on Brazil and, what is of more immediate importance, could cripple all south Atlantic shipping. But while we wait for this campaign, all eyes are on Suez. Churchill, who has never lied in his wartime speeches, thinks Wavell has a good chance of beating back the thrust from Libya. In Asia Minor the situation is more complicated. Will

the Germans take Crete, and use it as a base for moving troops by air into Syria? What will Turkey do? What is the significance of Russia's sending thousands of her best troops from Siberia to the German border? What will be the attitude of the Arabs in Palestine and throughout the Near East to a German land campaign directed at Suez? Has Germany really ships in the eastern Mediterranean as she says, and how many and what sort? Until these questions are answered, we can only say that the battle for Suez will be a grim and desperate one and that its outcome will cast a long shadow forward across the years.

Churchill's Six Points

Mr. Churchill's speech on April 27 was his usual impressive blend of inspiration and warning. There were minor pleasantries in the form of jibes at Hitler and Mussolini, a Clough quotation for President Roosevelt's Longfellow, and the happy use of words which are usually avoided by heads of states. Beneath these entertainment features, some half-dozen interesting points emerged. The rumors of Australian dissatisfaction over the use of their men in Greece were scotched. It was confirmed that General Wavell's Libyan victories were achieved with only 30,000 men. The present situation of Wavell's Egyptian forces was described as more favorable than their opponent's in Libya—a heartening statement when it comes from so realistic a prime minister. The warning that the Germans might push as far east as the Caspian Sea was repeated—and here again we should not think that Mr. Churchill's words were merely figures of speech. Finally, perhaps with more urgency than ever before,

CONTENTS

The Week	615
Editorials	
All Out Now!	618
The Subway Situation	619
Who is Behind Lindbergh?	620
General Articles	
Where Hitler Will Strike Next Max Werner	622
Life Insurance Faces Control	
. Richard Lee Strout	624
The Visit (verse) Sylvia Townsend Warner	626
Thunder-Gatherer (verse) Preston Newman	627
Germany Executes Her "Unfit"	
. Michael Straight	627

These Workers Don't Strike Arlen Marsh	629
Washington Notes T. R. B.	631
Critics in a Circle Stark Young	632
Safari, So Good Otis Ferguson	633
The Bandwagon	634
Correspondence	634
Shelley Plain Lionel Trilling	637
Books in Review	
Poets and Prophets Malcolm Cowley	639
Practical Democracy Emily Cheney	640
Praise from Sir Hubert Fletcher Pratt	640
Social Anatomy of Science Harold Ward	641
A Reader's List	641

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1941, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Churchill stressed that losses in the East could only be redressed by greater strength in the British Isles. "When I said . . . 'Give us the tools and we will finish the job' . . . I meant . . . put them within our reach." Mr. Churchill spoke warmly of how the new American patrol plan would aid in doing just this, and of our industrial contribution. More he could not say; it is for the people and Congress of the United States to decide how adequately we are fulfilling our promise of aid.

Coal Again

In spite of all the accusations against the miners' union for endangering defense production by the recent coal stoppage, it became clear at the end to all impartial persons that the real failure to agree lay between the Northern and the Southern operators. The miners, naturally enough, did not see why those in the South should be paid less than those in the North. The Northern operators agreed with them. But the Southern operators held out stubbornly for the existing wage differential. This was not a question of labor policy, but a quarrel about markets, and about whether Southern mines should be assured of their present proportion of the business, at the cost of labor.

At the beginning, Mr. Lewis had offered to continue production during negotiations, on condition that any wage increase should be retroactive. This offer was refused by the employers. After the Northern operators had reached an agreement with the union, and the President had reiterated the offer, it was accepted by the Northern operators, but rejected by the Southern employers. Mr. Lewis then agreed to send the Northern miners back to work alone, if the government would guarantee the safety of those still out in the South. This was no idle request, in view of the long history of shootings and maimings by thugs in the employ of Southern mine owners. Fortunately, these gentlemen eventually reconsidered and let the stoppage end.

The question of differential wages and freight rate still remains. It is a sign of the basic disorganization of the industry, frozen but not solved by the coal laws of the New Deal. We need a more basic solution than that now on the statute books.

What About Excess Profits?

The principal controversy between the Treasury and Congress about the new tax law seems to revolve about the proportion of the burden to be placed on the income tax, particularly in the middle brackets. We are enthusiastically in agreement with Secretary Morgenthau that general sales taxes and taxes on food should be avoided. If this must be the alternative, the congressional opposition clearly is in the wrong. There is, however, something to be said for reducing the income-tax exemptions further than the Treasury has recom-

mended, since even the lowest conceivable exemption would leave a majority of the population out of the tax.

What puzzles us is why the administration has not recommended amendment of the outrageously lenient excess-profits tax. Before private citizens, no matter how large or small their incomes, are asked to sacrifice heavily, it surely is in order to see that business institutions engaged in defense production do not make abnormally large profits out of the war. And yet that is just what many of them are doing and will do in greater measure. Some of them, under the present law, do not pay a cent in excess war taxation on immensely increased profits. Are there not Senators and Representatives with enough sense of decency to make a noise about this that will force the hand of the President?

Negroes Are People

The Supreme Court has acted with courage and justice in ruling that railroads in interstate commerce may not refuse Pullman accommodations to Negroes. Now that the Court has spoken, it is hard to see how any other interpretation could have been possible; as Mr. Chief Justice Hughes says, the issue is not segregation, but equality of treatment. In other words, the railroads did not furnish two Pullman cars substantially alike, one for Negroes and one for whites: they forced a Negro who was willing and able to pay for Pullman accommodation to ride in a day coach. In the past these coaches have often been filthy and have lacked proper light, heat and ventilation.

In action that is literally without precedent, the attorneys general of ten Southern states had jointly asked the Supreme Court not to rule on the case (which arose when Representative Arthur W. Mitchell of Chicago, a Negro, was forced to leave a Pullman car and enter a coach as his train from Chicago to Hot Springs reached Arkansas). Southern white leaders had taken the remarkable step of virtually offering a political compromise: if the Court would not demand equality of treatment for black and white, Southern sentiment would support large additional federal grants of money for Negro education in the South. But one does not bargain with the Supreme Court.

We recognize that ingrained race prejudice is not to be uprooted in a day. Progress will not be made by setting whites against blacks in a provocative manner. We take it for granted that the leaders of the Negro race will advise caution in the use of the rights just affirmed by the Court. In the long run, the solution of the Negro problem is first of all economic improvement and second, educating whole communities to understanding, tolerance and coöperation. Notable strides have been made in recent years. At the same time, the discrimination on railway trains has been such a flagrant violation of justice that its removal was long overdue, and especially in a time when democracy means more to Americans than it has in generations. We are

MAY 5, 1941

617

sure that responsible Southern leadership will welcome the action as much as will that of the North.

Timidity in the State Department

In voluntarily preparing a budget for 1940 which reduces the appropriation Congress granted it for 1941, the State Department shows an excess of modesty. Since the beginning of the war, the work of the Department, in Washington and in the field, has been enormously expanded. It must expand further. Hitler opened diplomatic and economic war against the United States even before his tanks smashed into Poland. It is being waged furiously now, and the United States Foreign Service is a fighting front, in the Far East, the Near East, South America, everywhere on the globe. Hitler supplies his warriors on this front with unstinted equipment. We must do likewise. In the latest bulletin of the Foreign Policy Association, W. T. Stone points out how hamstrung the State Department is by lack of research assistants, trained economists and a proper clerical staff. Ranking Foreign Service officers, including heads of missions, have to type their own dispatches, decode messages and do secretarial work. One South American legation has no stenographer; the minister must write reports in longhand.

The State Department and the Foreign Service are manned in general by devoted and able men who know that their work is of greatest importance. There are a certain number of anti-Semites and reactionaries (as Alfred Wagg, 3rd, noted in his article on refugees in last week's *New Republic*) most of whom settled down for well bred careers in the days when a gentleman could not quite be expected to enter the rough and tumble of other branches of public service. If the Department will hand these lads their hats and approach Congress with self-confidence, adequate funds for the proper performance of its work will undoubtedly be voted.

Two for the Board

The NLRB has won two more striking victories in the Supreme Court. The first establishes that a man may not be refused employment because of his union affiliation. The second makes it clear that the Board may set up bargaining units on a company-wide basis. Although both would appear to be only common sense if the Board is to bring about the democratic and peaceful labor relations the labor act demands, each was supported only by the five liberal appointees of President Roosevelt, and one—that relating to hiring—had been decided the other way by the Second Circuit Court.

In overruling the Circuit Court in the Phelps-Dodge case, Mr. Justice Frankfurter commented that "an embargo against employment of union labor was notoriously one of the chief obstructions to collective

bargaining through self-organization. Indisputably, the removal of such obstructions was the driving force behind the enactment of the National Labor Relations Act."

The matter of proper bargaining units is a complicated one, and one which the Board has decided upon the merits of each case. Both the current decisions are in a sense victories for the old board, since the cases were decided before the so-called conservatives attained a majority. William M. Leiserson, who formed the conservative minority at the time of the Crystal City bargaining-unit case, voted to certify one Pittsburgh Plate Glass Company plant where the CIO did not have a majority as a separate bargaining unit, and the Board's official policy now follows that line. This in no way lessens the necessity for permitting certification on a wider basis when the Board finds that proper.

A Proud Texan

The president of the W. Lee O'Daniel Flour Company of Fort Worth, Texas, who is also the president of the Fort Worth Chamber of Commerce, the author of "Beautiful Texas" and other poems and, incidentally, the Governor of Texas, is a proud man. He is proud that the Texas legislature at his urging suspended its constitutional rule and rushed through a bit of legislation which is supposed to attract vast numbers of Northern industrialists to the Lone Star State by telling them, in effect, that Texas flour makers and others can pay their workers whatever wages they please and give them whatever working conditions they see fit. Workers who strike and are held guilty of the elastic charge of "violence" will be put to work picking cotton on a prison farm. Like many other poets of not quite the first rank, Mr. O'Daniel loves publicity and is a great hand at letter-writing. He has been writing letters all over the place and sending out copies of the new law. He is getting publicity, as most any individual who is willing to make a fool of himself in a loud way can, for a little while. Whether Northern industrialists will believe that the legal and constitutional foundation on which Governor O'Daniel proposes to grow great is firm enough to warrant their shipping heavy machinery to Texas is another matter. Our guess is that the amount of new money attracted to beautiful Texas by this fascist-minded law isn't going to pay the postage on the publicity.

News Notes of a Week

The British strengthened their Singapore forces. A Japanese move south is expected before June by many Americans, British and Dutch in the Far East. Officially, no news. . . . Australian methods of patrolling the South Sea with big American planes are reported to have cleared German raiders out of those waters. . . . The British captured Dessaye, one of the

remaining Italian strongholds in Ethiopia. Free French forces, supported by British units, asked French troops in French Somaliland to join them. Control of the terminus of the Addis Ababa railroad at Jibuti, in French Somaliland, is at stake. . . . Emanuel Tsouderos, Greek Premier, says Greece will keep fighting from the island of Crete, where the government now is. . . . Eire's Minister of Coördination of Defense Measures declared that there was no possibility of the British being permitted to use Irish ports as bases.

The Gallup poll, on interviews obtained between April 10 and April 20, showed that 82 percent of the people of the United States believe that this country will enter the war. . . . General Marshall, Chief of Staff, told a Senate committee that the army is "over the hump," with 1,250,000 men properly organized and exhibiting "the highest morale I've ever seen." . . . Leon Henderson said that Germany was still outproducing the United States and Great Britain and that more planes, ships and ordnance are imperative. . . . Secretary Morgenthau attacked the tax on coffee, tea and sugar proposed by Colin E. Stam, chief of the staff of the Congressional Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation. He said that taxing the poor man's table was the worst possible way of raising revenue. . . . Better start saving for that income tax.

Announcement

We take pleasure in announcing that Max Lerner has become a contributing editor of *The New Republic* and Michael Straight our Washington editor.

All Out Now!

THIS COUNTRY is in the gravest danger in its whole history. That statement sounds inexcusably sensational, but it is literally true. In our danger the most important element is the fact that so many people refuse to believe it, and turn aside from it with a shrug.

We do not base our grave view of the situation on the defeat of the British, Greeks and Yugoslavs in the Balkans. That defeat we discounted long in advance, believing it to be likely. Even if the German pincers movement in North Africa and the Near East is successful, and the British lose Egypt, Suez and their foothold in Asia Minor, the result will not necessarily be catastrophe. They could fight on indefinitely, other things being equal, from the Far East and the British Isles themselves.

But other things are not equal. In the North Atlantic, the German attack on merchant shipping has been hideously successful. We cannot vouch for the accuracy of the statement that 40 percent of the American war supplies sent to England are resting on the bottom of the Atlantic, but with 100,000 tons a week being lost on the average, it is obvious that the figure cannot be

far out of the way. It is not merely a question whether England and the United States can build vessels as fast as they can be sunk (and at present they can build them only one-half as fast). The question is whether 60 percent of our production of war materials, plus what she can turn out from her own incessantly bombed factories, are enough to safeguard Britain against successful invasion, or surrender enforced for other reasons. Too long have the Americans been hiding complacently behind the admittedly tough fiber of the British people. "They are wonderful," we say. "They will never give up." It is true that they are wonderful; but it is not true that they can hold out forever if their position greatly worsens.

Within the past few days the blackness of the situation has come to be widely recognized. Many voices are now calling for the use of the American navy to convoy ships across the Atlantic. The President has responded by extending our neutrality patrol a thousand miles from the easternmost part of the American continent toward Ireland. Our naval vessels and planes will shuttle back and forth over an area two hundred miles wide and five times as long. If they see a German airplane, ship or submarine they will immediately report it to the British, who will be guided accordingly.

This is the technique we have long been using in our three-hundred-mile neutrality patrol and it has been quite effective, especially in the Caribbean and off the South American coast.

This new technique is a good deal better than nothing, and especially if the American patrol and the British naval operations are under the unified command which the experts say is imperatively necessary. The scheme will release to the British a good many of their naval vessels now being used in this hemisphere. They can either convoy more effectively or can try the plan to which some authorities are favorable of setting up a safety lane across the entire Atlantic, constantly patrolled by sea and air, in which each merchant ship can travel alone and at the maximum speed of which she is capable.

This is, then, a good beginning at effective aid; but it is far from being enough. Too many Americans do not yet realize that Hitler is almost as implacably opposed to us as he is to Great Britain; that he is determined to destroy our way of life throughout the world, including the United States; that he will employ whatever means seem to him best, not omitting military attack; that he is already using thousands of agents and millions of dollars here in "softening us up" in advance, as he has softened up every European country he has subjugated; that he has powerful allies in the form of the Americans who are already anti-democrats and will become more and more Nazi-minded if Hitler continues to be successful. Some of these individuals are already aware of the significance of their attitude, but most of them probably are not.

There is no use blinking the fact that up to now, the quality and speed of our defense effort are nothing of which Americans can be proud. Two and a half months ago The New Republic published a special supplement on Democratic Defense in which we gave a list of weaknesses in the defense program and proved our charges with indisputable facts. Practically all of our criticisms are just as valid today as they were then. No real consideration has yet been given to the Reuther Plan for utilizing idle men and machines in the automobile industry to turn out airplanes. Subcontracting of parts to small plants is still in its infancy, despite the enormous value this procedure has had for the British. (In general, the lack of communication between the United States and Britain and our failure to profit by her mistakes are simply amazing.)

Business men resist any increase in plant beyond what they think they can use profitably in private channels after the emergency is over—an attitude of mind for which, in Hitler's Germany, they would certainly be taken out and shot. The whole priority system is still handled as an effort to compromise between military necessities and business as usual, which the leading experts believe may get us into a desperate tangle a few months hence. We are not building ships by the pre-fabrication method employed so successfully in the last war and the Maritime Commission seems to be making no effort to increase the number of shipyards beyond the present quantity—which everybody except the Commission realizes is inadequate.

The drafted men in the army camps are suffering from the inevitable strains on morale which come from conscription in peacetime and from the fact that, in spite of all the boasting about "preparedness for M-Day," the army has not faced up to many elementary problems, including the all-important one of where to build its camps. Civilian experts in purchasing still have too much trouble with case-hardened officers who are not conspicuously able but came up to their posts simply by seniority. We have not yet solved the problem of getting rid of our incompetents in the higher ranks, who form an expensive luxury in time of peace and are an insupportable burden and danger to our safety in time of war. Most of all, nobody has ever answered the charge of Dr. Fritz Sternberg that we are thinking of aid to Britain (to say nothing of our own rearmament) on too small a scale, and that even to match what Germany is getting from her conquered territories and in other ways, we need to do five times as much as we are doing. In the phrase which Samuel Grafton used as the title of his excellent and too little regarded book, our democratic-defense effort must be "All Out."

Americans must shake off their creeping paralysis of the will and do it soon or the Battle for the World will be lost. Competent military experts tell us that practically the whole Atlantic fleet could be usefully employed at this moment in guarding the sea lanes in

the north and the south. They say it is imperative for our safety that we should have a naval and air base in Brazil at once, and that if the Brazilian government is not willing to grant this, irresistible pressure should be brought through the Pan-American Union. They tell us the United States should immediately land forces in the Azores and the Cape Verde Islands to protect the South Atlantic sea routes, as we are doing in Greenland and as Great Britain did in Iceland. They say, moreover, that it is absolutely essential that Dakar, on the West African coast, should be in American hands or those of some power unquestionably friendly to us. With airplanes easily capable of flying five or six thousand miles, a German-Italian force in Dakar could hamper and perhaps cut off entirely all water communication between ourselves and the south Atlantic, including all contact with the Argentine and other South American countries east of the Andes. We do not presume to pass upon the technical correctness of the statements made by these experts. What we do say is that whatever needs to be done to ensure our safety and to defeat fascism throughout the world should be done, regardless of any other consequence.

The Fascists, like the Communists, are fond of arguing that the sickness of the democracies is a fatal one, that we are incapable of pulling ourselves together and doing enough, in a short enough time, for our own defense. We do not believe that this charge is correct. Once he awakens to the seriousness of his situation, the American will rise to the emergency as he has risen in the past. The emergency is here; we hope the awakening will not come too late.

The Subway Situation

A BEAUTIFUL EXAMPLE of how not to handle labor-management relations is being given now in New York City by both sides of the struggle over the subway agreement. Something is evidently eating Mayor LaGuardia. He seems to have forgotten everything he ever knew about how crucial collective bargaining is for the economic health of the community, and how it ought to be carried on. He and the Board of Transportation have expressed their intention, when the collective-bargaining agreements between the unions and the subway companies expire in June, not to renew them; they have begun court action to void the contracts; they have made eleventh-hour civil-service concessions to the subway workers which are clearly intended to cut the ground from under the unions; and the Mayor has helped push through the state legislature the Wicks bill, which—whatever its intent—is so loosely slung that its prison penalties hang like a club over the unions in any potential strike.

In short, the Mayor is being provocative in much more than his usual verbally picturesque way. He is

acting provocatively, like any anti-labor corporation trying to smash a union. But if the Mayor is chiefly at fault, the Transport Workers' Union is not in any position to throw stones. The union leaders have acted not in the best tradition of pragmatic American unionism, but as if they were more concerned with causing trouble for LaGuardia than getting basic gains for their members. They seem to have delighted in fanning the fires the Mayor has started. The only exception has been a very sensible letter by Philip Murray to LaGuardia; but the calmness of tone manifested by the head of the CIO has not been echoed by the TWU officials. They have dragged in the extraneous issue of an "imperialist war," which can only serve to corroborate the charges that the TWU leadership is Communist and that the strike has political as well as economic objectives. They have left in many minds the impression that the bus strike was not called for its own sake but rather as a show of strength in preparation for the larger struggle to come. And most recently Michael Quill, the head of the TWU, has talked of the subway strike as a possible precedent for the organization of firemen and policemen in a way which again seemed irresponsibly to drag in extraneous issues.

Both sides have been arguing the question of the right to strike in government employment, the Mayor denying it and Mr. Quill affirming it. The issue may have to be faced some day, but meanwhile it is unfortunate to make it the central and mooted question. The Mayor must know that trade-union organization has existed for many decades among government employees, both in America and Europe. It has existed among the postal employees, among navy-yard and government-arsenal workers and cantonment-construction workers. By refusing to negotiate at all with the TWU leaders, the Mayor is in effect denying the right of the trade union to exist among government employees. And here he is not, as he may perhaps think, charting the future, but turning his back upon the past, brusquely and blindly. There can be no doubt of the right of workers in government employment and even under the civil service to organize in trade unions. As for their right to strike, considered as an abstract question, there can again be no doubt that it exists, except in the actual military forces where the standards of the labor movement do not obtain.

The mistake is to view all this as an abstract question. If what we are aiming at is industrial peace and at the same time decent conditions for labor, the focus of attention will be on the methods that have thus far proved successful, both in private and government employment, in resolving difficulties. Those methods are the patient and pragmatic adjustment of differences through the consulting of men none of whom wants trouble. We call upon both Mayor LaGuardia and Mr. Quill to stay within that tradition. The ques-

tion is not one of absolute rights, but of the wisdom of certain courses of policy. Surely the Mayor has seen enough of life to know that you cannot solve labor difficulties by the use of the big stick except in the coercive monopoly state; and that the anti-union rabble-rousing he has been indulging in is being lapped up eagerly by men who hate the name of LaGuardia as much as they hate the name of Quill. And surely Mr. Quill must know that the context of public opinion within which he operates is not, at best, a good one; that the middle-class mind shrinks from the idea of strikes in the municipal services; and that if he calls a strike except as a last and desperate resort, the resulting violence and chaos will be even more destructive to the workers' cause than to LaGuardia's own political fortunes.

There is dynamite in the subway situation. It will explode unless it is handled by men who are not blinded by personal and political motives. And the explosion will reach beyond the transit industries and beyond New York. For the government will in the future exercise increasing control and operation in an ever growing area of industrial life. And the pattern of solution that is worked out now will be crucial for the future.

Who Is Behind Lindbergh?

ASIDE FROM CONDEMNATION of the policies of defeatism and appeasement advocated by Colonel Lindbergh, there is a good deal of discussion of the methods and motives of his campaign. Who, it is asked, is counselling him in action and who is writing his speeches? Do the pro-Nazis and anti-British who are so prominent at his meetings have any closer association with him? A reporter who has known and followed him ever since the transatlantic flight writes for PM that he is cold, calculating and ambitious, that he decides with mathematical foresight on the course that will best feed his ego—whether for advancement or revenge.

Dorothy Thompson disputes Walter Lippmann's statement that Lindbergh is naïve, and argues that his utterances and actions exactly fit the pattern of one who in planning to take over this country as a Gauleiter for Hitler. There was an undeniably sinister note in the resignation of his reserve commission in the army—as if the President, by opposing his political attitude, were trying as Commander-in-Chief to suppress his civil liberties. It is out of just such dramatized grievances that fascist leaders acquire followers.

We should not be surprised by any demonstration that the Lindbergh campaign is a group activity, carefully planned and well financed. It is less credible that the advice and the organization come from the foreign enemies of this country—though even that is possible.

Such charges, however, should not be bandied about recklessly in a nation that wishes to preserve its democratic integrity and its freedom of utterance. For sincere and patriotic opposition to the administration's policy is possible, and will not be suppressed by patriotic terrorism.

To us it is much more important to inquire into the social forces which can yield a substantial amount of popular support to any such movement as Lindbergh is accused of plotting. There lies the chief element of danger, since no potential dictator, even with the most approved conspiratorial technique, can win power in a nation that is not in large part psychologically ready to accept him. The basic explanation of Hitler lies neither in the man himself nor in the methods of the Nazis, but in the immense amount of destructive frustration lying about among the German people, which this man and these methods were able to exploit.

Psychiatrists know that there is no better way of producing a neurotic animal, man or nation than to condition the subject to expect certain satisfactions and fulfilments, to instil into him certain standards of judgment and decision, and then to deny those satisfactions and upset those standards. The confusions of many young persons and other elements in the community today are probably due very largely to this type of frustration. They were taught to expect freedom of opportunity, a "good life" and the highest standard of living in the world, and then were turned out to compete in a society where opportunity even to earn a decent living was denied to many of them, and enterprise and economic expansion were almost completely stalled. They were brought up to believe that America would prosper in so far as she sought to materialize her own faith and remained aloof from the bickerings of the old world, that war was senseless waste and offered a solution for nothing. Now they are told that this country is deeply affected by what goes on in Europe and Asia, and that war—at least at one remove—is necessary to prevent destruction of a culture that they never had much reason to value highly anyway.

This main pattern has been dramatized by the present administration. It set out to seek a solution of our own problems within our own borders, telling the rest of the world—in the London Economic Conference and elsewhere—to go mind its own business. Great hopes were held out for a new order in this country, in which unemployment would be banished and opportunity restored. But, in spite of many reforms, the eyes of the administration seemed to many to be withdrawn from the native scene long before its aims had been achieved, and concentrated instead on a foreign war. All this may well be unaccountable to those conditioned to expect something else, especially in view of the experience of 1914-17, during or immediately after which many of them were growing up.

People so conditioned and so disappointed are more likely to feel that they detect something superficial and false in the attitude of the Roosevelts than in that of the Lindberghs. They are more likely to respond to the appeal of "America First" than to condemnation for lack of patriotism, failure to believe in spiritual values, or the importance of first principles. It is surprising that Lindbergh's followers are not more numerous, instead of being, as they seem to be, a fairly small minority. There is a real danger that, in the coming competition for leadership, the same tendency that is now expressing itself in the minority will come to the surface in many others.

Two things at least are necessary to avoid this outcome. One is a far better bridge of understanding, to be built by those in authority, from the road on which they set out to the road on which they are now traveling. They must show more concretely that they have not abandoned the goals of the New Deal, that these goals are still in process of fulfilment, that the national purpose is not incompatible with the struggle against Hitler but instead is dependent on it. They must also find ways of reassuring the doubtful that this is not, like the last war, an "imperialist" struggle dressed up in fake humanitarian phrases, that they are not just another crowd of partly innocent and partly dishonest Wilsonian liberals, ready to lead youth to destruction and misery with a rainbow of fine words. They must show these things now, not merely by speech but by action.

The other and final necessity is to avoid frustration of the new hopes they have aroused. Having enlisted the nation for the defeat of Hitler, they must be sure not only of victory in the field, but of creating afterwards the kind of peace in this country and abroad that will have been worth the sacrifice—and not merely in the sense of avoiding something worse. For nothing would more surely endanger the future of this country than to overpower the Lindberghs while the war is on, and then give them the chance to prove that they were right all the while.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Editors: BRUCE BLIVEN, MALCOLM COWLEY, GEORGE SOULE, STARK YOUNG; *Washington Editor:* MICHAEL STRAIGHT; *Treasurer:* DANIEL MEBANE; *Assistant Editors:* NIGEL DENNIS, BYRON DEXTER, OTIS FERGUSON, ELIZABETH HULING; *Contributing Editors:* H. N. BRAILSFORD, VAN WYCK BROOKS, JULIAN HUXLEY, MAX LERNER, E. C. LINDEMAN, R. G. TUGWELL; *Advertising Manager:* E. G. WOOD

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION, SIX DOLLARS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

EDITED AND PRODUCED UNDER UNION CONDITIONS BY CONTRACT WITH THE BOOK AND MAGAZINE GUILD, LOCAL 18, UOPWA, CIO

Where Hitler Will Strike Next

LET NO ONE UNDERESTIMATE the importance of the British defeat in the Balkans and the menace to the British positions in Africa and the Near East. Winston Churchill's strategy was meant to go beyond the passive defense of the British Isles: hence the offensive in Africa and intervention in the Balkans. Crushing the armies of Graziani and the Duke of Aosta was part of the plan for active Empire defense. The sortie into the Balkans was to bring British strategy back to the European continent. In the Balkans that strategy encountered the superiority of the Third Reich in Continental warfare. It would be erroneous to regard the British campaign in the Balkans as an attempt to force a two-front war upon the Third Reich. It was no two-front war, because the Third Reich is not engaged in land warfare in the West. It was not even a one-front war, for the British campaign in the Balkans, having merely improvised points of support, was unable to rest on an orderly, stabilized front. The Third Reich was able to hurl the unlimited reserves of its shock troops and Luftwaffe against the small British Expeditionary Force and the poorly armed Greek and Yugoslav armies. The Balkan mountain country offered virtually no obstacle. The hilly terrain was quickly mastered by the Luftwaffe, and by German motor-mechanized troops and alpine divisions. Again it was proved that in modern warfare the fire strength, mobility and tactical skill of the armies decide the issue, and that position cannot measurably increase defensive resistance beyond its own strength. Once the Yugoslav, Greek and British defenders were pinned down by enemy fire from the air and on land, once they were overwhelmed and encircled by enemy maneuvers, the capture of mountain positions was mere military mountain-climbing sport for the German attackers. In the Balkan campaign it was arms superiority that carried the day; and more than ever before Anglo-Saxon strategy is confronted with the task of grasping the technique and the tactics of modern Continental warfare.

In the campaign in Libya and Egypt, German strategy is attempting to carry Continental warfare to North Africa. The Mediterranean is to be conquered for the present, by means of the bridge that leads from Sicily to western Libya. In my just published book¹ I characterized German strategy as the classic Continental strategy. It aims at the superiority of fighting forces of the Continental type, consisting of a combination of land army and air force, as against fighting forces of the Anglo-Saxon type, consisting of a combination of sea power and air force. The German High Command now seeks to apply the full force

of this Continental strategy in the Mediterranean theatre too—to organize and exploit its superiority on land and in the air. In this process the Italian navy, seconded by the Luftwaffe, has limited auxiliary functions. Its primary task is to secure the German bridge from Sicily to Libya—a task similar to that entrusted to the German navy in the operations against Norway. In addition, it is to cut off the horizontal British communications line across the length of the Mediterranean, from Gibraltar to Alexandria and Piraeus, and to throttle overseas communications to the British troops in the Balkans and North Africa.

Two conceptions of combined naval and land warfare come face to face here. Proceeding from control of the sea, British strategy seeks to attain control of the coasts—or at least to defend its own coasts in the south and east Mediterranean. German strategy on the other hand seeks to proceed to control of the sea from the struggle for the coasts, conquered in land and air warfare. By expanding its bridgehead in Libya and launching further new advances on land toward the Near East and Northwest Africa it actually seeks to drive the British navy from the Mediterranean, giving control of these waters to the Italian navy.

Churchill's far-sighted and virile strategy lacked reserves. The strategic reserves of the Empire assembled during the winter of 1940-41 in Egypt were insufficient for simultaneous warfare in North Africa and the Balkans. In the Balkans the German enemy had ten-fold superiority in numbers, arms and war planes. The British troops in the Balkans hung by the slender thread of the vertical Mediterranean route based on Suez and Alexandria. The British naval squadron in the eastern Mediterranean seized the initiative, but it was not strong enough to fight a battle of annihilation against the Italian navy; the forces were simply insufficient for a second Trafalgar.

The German offensive in the Mediterranean basin will now undoubtedly be carried in several directions, with corresponding expansion of the theatre of war. The German bridgehead in Libya will exert powerful pressure to the east as well as the west, toward the Suez Canal as well as to French North Africa. It is the center of a pincers, the jaws of which are now being formed and set into motion from the two southernmost peripheral points of the European continent—the Dardanelles and Gibraltar. There can be no question that German strategy seeks to push into North Africa across these three bridges—the Dardanelles and Gibraltar, in addition to Sicily-Libya. The path across the Dardanelles and Asia Minor is undoubtedly beset with greater diplomatic and material handicaps, but unquestionably this course too is in prospect. But the path that is to the

¹ Battle for the World: The Strategy and Diplomacy of the Second World War. New York: Modern Age Books. 403 pages. \$3.

fore for the moment is the one by way of France and Spain to Gibraltar and Morocco. Vichy and Madrid are the centers of the German diplomatic offensive; the western Mediterranean is the next goal. On this subject I wrote in my book:

The localization of war operations in the eastern Mediterranean cannot be of long duration. For the western and central Mediterranean, the region between Gibraltar-Ceuta and Bizerte, to remain outside the theatre of war can be but a passing phase. The coasts and bases of enfeebled Spain and the North African heritage of the French Republic form for the moment a military vacuum, a no-man's land; but it is not in the power of General Franco, nor even less in that of General Weygand, to keep this zone outside the war. The Third Reich is unquestionably determined to wage a struggle from the western Mediterranean for the entire Mediterranean basin and Africa. The plan amounts to consolidating and putting into action under German leadership the combined Italian, French and Spanish positions and fleets in the Mediterranean. ("Battle for the World," p. 279.)

Hitler will try with all possible means to take possession of the French and Spanish bases—by means of promises, corruption, terror if necessary, disintegration from within and military pressure from without. He will shrink from nothing. Even now Moroccan formations are being set up in French North Africa under German leadership. The work has long been prepared. During their internment in Germany, Moroccan prisoners of war were segregated, given military training and imbued with hatred and contempt for beaten France. Then they were sent back to Morocco to form German-Moroccan troop units. French Nationalist observers estimate that these returned Moroccans number 80,000.

It is no longer possible to have any illusions regarding Weygand. From the beginning, he has wagered on British defeat. He ruthlessly purged the French and Colonial troops in North Africa of Nationalist De Gaullist and pro-British elements which were strongly represented there. When the British troops in February, 1941, after their initial successes, stood at the borders of Tripolitania and a wave of pro-British and anti-German sentiment arose in the French African army, Weygand resorted to repressive measures and dismissals. The men who engineered the French surrender can no longer swerve from their path—it is merely a question of the price or of the degree of German pressure. Franco is being promised Portugal and French Morocco. Hitler is simultaneously playing on Arab nationalism, Pan-Hispanic imperialism and the collaboration of the Vichy and Paris politicians—all are somehow to be satisfied, at the expense of others. In the winter of 1940-41 it was not the loans and food shipments but the British successes in Libya and the Italian defeats in the Balkans that kept Franco and Pétain from opening the doors of North Africa to

Hitler. Only military counter-pressure can today hope for the same effect.

Spain actually has a threefold importance for the Third Reich. First, she holds a key position in the western Mediterranean and forms a land bridge to West Africa. At the same time she has a first-class strategic position in the Atlantic, and for years German military literature has stressed this important aspect. In 1937 Franz Pauser wrote in his book, "Spain's Door to the Mediterranean and the Catalan Question": "Spain's strongest naval base, El Ferrol, with the small sea fort of Vigo, flanks all the Atlantic sea routes at Europe's western corner."

And in September, 1938, the German military organ, *Wissen und Wehr*, expressed itself even more clearly: "With its Galician sea forts, Spain flanks all the British trade routes into the South Atlantic and the Mediterranean. Spain itself will hardly ever be in a position to proceed aggressively against British sea power; but as a base for a foreign power this position may gain a dangerous importance similar to that of Brittany."

Possession of Spanish (and Portuguese) naval bases is to be exploited against the two vital British sea-lines in the Atlantic—the southern route to the United States and the great Cape route around Africa. In other words, German control of Spain is not merely part of the plan for striking against the British Empire from the Mediterranean and North Africa, but it is also part of the intensification of the German war of strangulation against the British Isles. And in the final analysis German action in Spain is aimed at South America. Strategically, Spain is the springboard to Casablanca and Dakar, by way of Morocco to West Africa. Politically, culturally and nationally, too, Spain is to become the direct bridge from Hitler Europe to South America. As the *Völkische Beobachter* said on October 12, 1940:

Madrid or Washington, Europe or the United States—that is the fateful question confronting Latin America in the year 1940! The Europe of tomorrow . . . will be totalitarian, under the aegis of the Axis. To come close to this Europe in time is, therefore, an imperative task for Latin America, especially since the role of Spain in the new occidental constellation will suit it ideally to become a bridge and an alleviating force.

The crisis that has exploded in the eastern Mediterranean, the Balkans and Northeast Africa touches the entire Mediterranean, rolls furiously over all of North Africa to West Africa and more and more clearly concentrates around Dakar, the strategic focus that dominates the whole South Atlantic, from which the Eastern Hemisphere threatens the Western. Today more than ever the interrelations between the war fronts, the strategic positions and the Continents must be understood. The Balkans, the Mediterranean, North Africa, West Africa and the Atlantic today form a strategic unit. It was the approaches to South America

that were being fought for in Greece, that are being fought for today on the Libyan-Egyptian frontier. The hint dropped by Kintner and Alsop in their syndicated column on April 21 deserves full attention: "If the opportunity passes and French North Africa falls into German hands, then it will not be long before Dakar goes too. Dakar is only 1,700 miles by air from the bulge of Brazil, where an air base is being built by the Brazilians but has not yet been opened to us by the German-infiltrated Brazilian army."

The question is no longer whether there will be a struggle for Africa. It is a question of the direction from which the struggle will come—from what positions and for what part of Africa. It is a question of the rate and the extent of American aid and American action. The German success in Libya, the German penetration into North Africa—these do not speak against the importance of sea power but only against its use limited to an extent that cannot guarantee effective control of the sea. It turns out that Britain alone

cannot master the tasks of Churchill's strategy—a strategy approved in the United States. These tasks, however, are capable of fulfilment by a coördinated Anglo-American strategy. Had the United States joined in defending the coasts of North Africa against German invasion, the picture would have been a different one. With the combined use of the Anglo-American navy in the Mediterranean, a German landing in Libya would have been impossible. The Italian navy could have been blasted out of the water. The route from Gibraltar to Alexandria could have been kept open. North Africa would have been impregnable and just about inaccessible for the Third Reich. The Mediterranean would have been an impassable barrier for the Axis, and the super-battle for Africa from Suez to Casablanca could have been won without trouble. All these possibilities were quite real, and perhaps they still exist today. The strategic position of the Anglo-Saxon powers is of critical importance in the struggle for the Mediterranean and North Africa.

MAX WERNER

Life Insurance Faces Control

THE TNEC has just completed the first federal investigation of life insurance in American history. It disclosed one basic fact, if nothing else: that the grievances which the Armstrong Committee under Charles Evans Hughes found in 1906 continue today, frequently in aggravated form. And at least one major new one has been added.

The Armstrong Committee found that certain life-insurance companies were dangerously big. Today they are bigger.

It found mutuality in the election of directors a myth. It is still a myth.

It found that the companies lobbied "clandestinely." They still do. They have a national lobby working in forty-eight states.

It was horrified at the extravagant lapse rate. The lapse rate is as high as ever—95 percent of all industrial policies that go off the books are lapsed—and the sums involved are vastly bigger.

On top of this the new investigation, one-third of a century later, discovers something that the grim, young Hughes did not uncover: comprehensive collusion and price-fixing, an army of bitterly competitive agents scurrying about in frantic contest for sales in policies whose essential terms have been largely set by agreement. As with cigarettes, the competition is in the sales talk, not the product.

And above all it discovers that life insurance has become a reservoir of economic power so vast as to be difficult to comprehend, a veritable Mississippi of savings pouring into a central ocean of economic power, whose outgoing sluices are controlled by a handful of

self-perpetuating officers. This ocean of accumulated savings can only flow out again into certain channels prescribed by law, channels that take it into debt investment, not into new wealth-creating industrial expansion or venture capital. This growing accumulation of national funds so limited by law is already producing serious consequences—huge cash balances of idle money and a scramble for the inadequate supply of securities in which it may be invested. How deep this ocean can become before it overflows its banks and threatens the whole national economy remains to be seen. The waters are rising.

After thirty-five years of refusing to face the problems disclosed by the Armstrong Committee and Mr. Hughes, we find the problems are incomparably more serious than they were before. Take mere size. The Armstrong Committee said "the business of the Mutual, the Equitable and the New York Life has grown beyond reasonable limits . . . no useful purpose will be served by their becoming larger." At that time the companies had combined assets of \$1,500,000,000.

Today they have \$6,000,000,000 worth of assets. The 365 legal reserve companies have \$28,000,000,000. This wealth is enormously concentrated. Two companies control one-third of it; five companies control one-half; twenty-six companies control 90 percent of it. Most of these companies center in and around New York City. It is the bottleneck through which much of America's wealth passes.

The biggest companies are growing rapidly. The principal companies show an increase in assets of 50 percent in ten years. The Metropolitan, for example, with

\$5,000,000,000 worth of assets and a policy on every fifth person in the United States, has to invest \$2,000,000 of its policy-holders' money every business day. Its financial interests bob up in the most curious places. For instance, it harvested 6,000,000 pounds of peanuts in 1937. I like to think of the frock-coated directors in the Metropolitan tower chatting about their peanut crop.

Insurance companies are banks. "The amazing truth is," exclaimed Chairman O'Mahoney at one of the hearings, "that insurance-company assets are increasing faster than insurance itself!"

This is partly because premium income has been based upon so generous an actuarial return, computed upon a mortality table drawn up in 1868 when American life expectancy was years shorter than it is today, that it has paid *all* the companies' costs and met *all* the companies' expenditures (including those to policy-holders) in every year save four in the past half-century, leaving the income from the companies' investments so much velvet. There is no end in sight for this rolling snowball save in a shortage of these very bonds in which the companies may invest. Life-insurance companies are putting a first mortgage on America.

Here is a concentration of power not equaled elsewhere in the national economy. These companies are growing and must by their very nature continue to grow. The depression aided them: investors saw them as havens of refuge while other arks were sinking. Today they are acquiring a constantly increasing proportion of the country's public and private debt. They have an insatiable appetite for bonds. In 1938 the leading companies bought 47.7 percent of all corporate bonds and notes issued in that year.

Here are concrete illustrations: in 1938 the twenty-six biggest companies held one-quarter of all of Standard Oil of New Jersey's funded debt, one-third of Shell's and all of Gulf's; in the rubber industry they owned one-quarter of Firestone's, 80 percent of Good-year's and all of United States Rubber's.

In general, the criticism of life-insurance companies is not that they are not well managed, but that they are too powerful and too free from regulations. They are run by self-perpetuating officers who are practically independent of policy-holder control; these, in turn, are interlocked with directors of other great aggregations of wealth. Take one illustration: for years there has been an intimate connection between Metropolitan and the Chase National bank. The TNEC disclosed how the two operated; Metropolitan picked correspondents of the bank for its receiverships, saw to it that its mortgaged hotels kept accounts with Chase depositors, that owners of buildings in debt to it bought cement from the right companies—Pennsylvania-Dixie Cement Corporation, for instance, which keeps a balance with Chase. Chase reciprocated in kind.

Winthrop W. Aldrich was put on the stand and asked whether he found himself as director of the Metropolitan in conflict with himself as chairman of the Chase National in matters involving them both.

"I don't know what you are referring to," said Mr. Aldrich over and over. He maintained this position despite considerable questioning.

Through the hands of these men passes much of the country's wealth. Theoretically the mutual companies are coöperative and non-profit-making, a condition in which many similar enterprises flourish without high salaries. But the TNEC shows that life-insurance officers are self-perpetuating. They are a law unto themselves. Leroy A. Lincoln, president of Metropolitan, got \$125,000 a year, and so did Mutual Life's President Houston; President D'Olier of Prudential and Chairman of the Board Buckner of New York Life got \$100,000. President Parkinson of Equitable put up with \$75,000, the same salary the American people pay President Roosevelt. The power of these men goes far beyond that of mere mortgage-holders; they exert the rights of creditors and exercise continued control over their investments, so that their financial decisions affect and guide the whole business community. Here is concentration wholly outside federal control but too big for any single state to cope with. It is the fulcrum of economic power in America.

The Armstrong investigation found that insurance companies lobbied "clandestinely." That this situation still continues is shown in the activities of the Association of Life Insurance Presidents, the present lobby agency which operates in every state. In 1934, for example, Lewis A. Irons was deputy insurance commissioner in Georgia. Robert L. Cooney, who was nominally an employee of New York Life, was actually the state lobbyist of the association. On December 1, Insurance Commissioner Irons wrote Lobbyist Cooney that it would be a "good investment" to pay the \$10 occupation tax as insurance salesman for one Harold Dobbins, a gentleman who was (1) a state legislator; (2) an agent of New York Life; and (3) chairman of the legislature's insurance committee (picked for the post at the instance of insurance men). Legislator Dobbins had complained to Commissioner Irons that "he found himself unable at this time to pay the tax levied against him." Irons' note concluded, "Think it over, and destroy this letter when you have its contents in mind."

What a situation! A state legislator panhandling a miserable \$10 from a lobbyist at the instance of a deputy commissioner. It casts an illuminating sidelight on the chances of individual states to control these economic mastodons.

Dozens of similar, and graver, instances were offered. The record reveals telegram barrages organized against bills; payment of \$100 to a reporter to retail gossip from the legislative floor; entertainment for

wives and daughters of law-makers; a threat to one doctor-legislator to stop his insurance-examination fees. All this happened thirty-five years after the Armstrong Committee declared that employment of "clandestine methods to defeat legislation is wholly inexcusable."

Time after time, the TNEC revealed, the Association has fought the introduction in other states of the Massachusetts-New York plan of savings-bank life insurance, developed by Louis D. Brandeis in 1907. The association has special blitz squads which it rushes to trouble zones when a particular bill is up. The Brandeis plan is the most serious threat to the life-insurance monopoly. It provides over-the-counter, "cafeteria" purchase of insurance, without high-pressure solicitation or expensive selling organizations of any kind. As a result of its simple machinery it sells its policies for one-third to two-thirds less than do the regular companies. Average yearly net cost per \$1,000 of protection at the age of thirty-five in Massachusetts is \$2.75 under the savings-bank system, compared to a charge of from \$4.60 to \$8.73 for the same thing by twenty-seven competitive regular companies in the same state.

A feature of the Brandeis system is that the lapse rate is negligible. The revelation of the high percentage of lapses in regular companies was an outstanding disclosure of the TNEC. In the decade up to 1938, some \$133,000,000,000 worth of insurance terminated in America, of which 80 percent represented what an SEC expert called the "frustration" of the buyers' original objective, including \$65,000,000,000 lost by lapse (forfeiture) attributable primarily to high-pressure salesmanship.

In a period of twenty years ending in 1938, policy-holders lost \$1,400,000,000 through forfeiture of savings. Industrial insurance, bought by poor people at extravagant cost, shows the most startling lapse rate. The selling of these policies reaches a feverish pitch. "Lapsation" in some companies rises as high as 97 percent. In the 1928-38 decade, 198,000,000 such policies were issued or renewed, but at the end of that time such policies actually in force had increased by only 6,500,000, a ratio of twenty-nine steps back for every thirty forward. The situation is a national scandal.

The TNEC made one final revelation. Prior to its investigation it was generally believed that life insurance was not subject to anti-competitive agreements. It now develops that the big companies have practised systematic price-fixing. Here the evidence is definitive. Testimony shows that the companies made agreements under the shadow of the anti-trust law. Standardized rates may be socially desirable, just as it may be argued that it is necessary to run a lobby service to guard against the varying venality of forty-eight erratic state legislatures. The point is that these agreements, like the lobbying, were "clandestine," and were reached without the scrutiny of regulatory authority and without the voice of any representative of the public.

Senator O'Mahoney was never anxious to see a hard-hitting insurance investigation. The facts disclosed under the examination of the brilliant young SEC counsel, Gerhard A. Gesell, were so formidable that he could do nothing to prevent the study from going forward. It is not surprising that the TNEC backed hurriedly away from the thought of federal regulation in its final report. It made one drastic recommendation, that industrial insurance be straightway reformed or abolished. In other fields it pleaded plaintively for state action. After thirty-five years, state action was to be given another chance.

But the problem can't wait thirty-five years longer. It has grown too great. It does not lie primarily in the nationwide lobby, the inter-company agreements, the high lapse rate, the scandal of industrial insurance. Nor is it to be found entirely in the fact that if ever there was an interstate business it is life insurance. The problem lies in the rising tide of insurance savings, invested faster and faster in sterilized bonds and mortgages until it threatens to comprise a first mortgage on the nation itself. It represents an economic problem too big for state regulation. The government must step in.

RICHARD LEE STROUT

The Visit

On Sunday evenings
When the good folks have taken
Themselves to the sermon
I visit you.

I bring you a present:
Plums, it may be, or apples
Grown in my garden;
For that is due.

I bring my children
And talk about their doings;
You give them pennies,
And that is due.

I tell my troubles:
The price of food, and air raids;
Kindly you listen,
And that is due.

Past times we speak of,
Old scandals and dead neighbors.
You praise my husband,
And that is due.

I stay my welcome
No longer than is civil,
And from your doorway
You wave me adieu.

The organ is playing—
Homeward unused I carry,
In hate and wont I bury,
The love that drives me
To visit you.

SYLVIA TOWNSEND WARNER

Thunder-Gatherer

Me? I gather thunder for the guns.
 To aid defense—that's what my orders said.
 Know why they picked me out? One August day
 I drove the wagon up where pasture runs
 To mountain, got all set for loading hay.
 Thunder broke in a hollow overhead
 And tumbled down in the pasture's lap.
 One thing I've got a taste for—thunder on tap.
 I piled the wagon full and raced my hell
 On wheels to the barn, barreled what I could,
 And dumped the surplus thunder down the well.
 I near went deaf. Old Sampson skittered so
 He balled some racket on his hooves for good.
 (You hear it when he runs on frozen ground.)
 The barrels still let booms of thunder go
 If rolled downstairs. Think that rumbling sound

Got lonesome in the well and found a crack?
 Shout down some time. Thunder answers back.

But guns. My Lord, it takes a bumper crop
 To fill *those* wells. Where will this thing stop?
 Once they sent a note, "Please plow under,
 At our expense, every third peal of thunder."
 Now they write, "Rush All Rumpus!" Some night
 This spring, if April doesn't turn off dry,
 Come watch me work: I'll train a lantern's light
 On grumbling clouds that roll across the sky,
 I'll raid the heavens in a bouncing kite,
 And storm the stars when sparks of lightning fly.
 The fool digs down for shelter, the coward runs—
 Me? Give me thunder. I feed the guns.

PRESTON NEWMAN

Germany Executes Her "Unfit"

OUT OF the fastness of Germany has come the story of an act as terrible in its cruelty as any known of Hitler's regime.

The sole outward evidence lies buried in a back page of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, the official monthly publication of the Vatican, in which Pope Pius XII decrees the policies which his bishops are to follow. It is a decree signed by the Notary of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office; it is entitled "Concerning the Direct Killing of the Innocent Done by Order of Public Authority."

The decree is in the form of a question sent to the Pope by an unnamed bishop. It reads: "It was asked of this Supreme Sacred Congregation: 'Whether, by order of public authority, it is licit directly to kill those who, although they have committed no crime deserving death, yet, because of mental or physical defects, are no longer able to benefit the nation, and are considered rather to burden the nation and to obstruct its energy and strength.'"

The bishop was a German bishop. He asked whether it was right for thousands of infirm and aged Germans to be put to death by Adolf Hitler because they were no longer of service in Hitler's war economy.

The decree continues: "In a general session of the Supreme Sacred Congregation held on Wednesday, November 27, 1940, the Eminent and Most Reverend Cardinals appointed to safeguard faith and morals, having heard the 'votum' of the Reverend Doctors Consultors, ordered that it must replied:

"**'IN THE NEGATIVE,'** since it is contrary to natural and divine positive law." This decree Pope Pius approved and ordered to be published.

In this article there are presented for the first time the facts which lie behind this decree. They have been

brought to me by a dignitary of the Church whose name must necessarily be withheld.

The facts are these: in September, October and November of 1940, 85,000 blind, incurably ill or aged Germans were put to death by the Gestapo. They were put to death as casually as the SPCA chloroforms old and helpless dogs.

They were not killed for mercy. They were killed because they could no longer manufacture guns in return for the food which they consumed; because the German hospitals were needed for wounded soldiers; because their death was the ultimate logic of the National Socialist doctrine of racial superiority and the survival of the physically fit.

This direct killing of the innocent done by order of public authority was not discovered at once.

There is a big hospital near Urach in Wurttemberg. In September the priests of Urach noticed that the elderly people in the hospital were dying in increasing numbers, and dying on certain days.

These priests discovered that systematic euthanasia was being practised in this hospital. The old and incurably ill were being killed off by the injection of small quantities of poison into their veins. The poison was one which causes death and cannot be detected.

Later, according to the accounts of these priests, the Gestapo found that poisoning was unnecessarily expensive. Gas chambers were used, the priests reported, until the Nazis found an even simpler method which involved no cost at all. Air bubbles were injected into the veins of those chosen to die, and death was instantaneous when the bubbles reached the heart.

Relatives of the victims were never told, of course. They merely received a small box containing the victim's ashes. Nor could the truth escape easily from



This is a reproduction of the top half of the cover of the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, the official monthly publication of the Vatican. In the next column is reproduced the Latin text from which the summary in the article is translated. — THE EDITORS

Germany. The Public Health Service at Washington learned only that tubercular patients in Germany were given death sentences when the war broke out, in the form of compulsory labor in munitions factories, which their weakened bodies could not stand.

From the pulpits in Germany Catholic priests began to unveil this appalling story. They delivered sermons protesting against euthanasia and sterilization, and they were strengthened in their stand on December 16 by the decree of the Vatican which has been quoted and which warned that euthanasia was contrary to the laws of the Church.

The reply of the Nazis was drastic and immediate. More than three hundred Catholic priests were imprisoned in concentration camps, and the publication of the decree in the churches of Germany was forbidden.

Today the practice of euthanasia is still continuing in Germany and the persecution of the Catholics has been intensified. Refugees report that religious education has been abolished and Sunday schools closed. Catholic members of the Hitler Jugend, the Bund Deutscher Mädchen and the Arbeitsdienst are discouraged from attending church. Abbeys, monasteries and convents are used to quarter Germans brought to the Reich from Rumania, Russia and the Baltic

countries. The Episcopal sees of Aachen, Paderborn and Cologne are vacant because the Nazis prevented the nomination of new bishops, while at Rottenburg, Bishop Sproll was exiled and his palace fired and destroyed because he refused to vote for Hitler in a "free election." In Poland, where the monasteries have been seized and sometimes destroyed, the Catholics suffered most of all, although the campaign to exterminate the Church has been carried on in Austria, Czecho-Slovakia, Belgium and France as well. Unlike the Jews, however, Catholics are seldom permitted to leave Germany. The church dignitary who gave me this information charges that the majority of the 800,000 prisoners in German concentration camps are Catholics.

MICHAEL STRAIGHT

DAIN COHENEL (pseudonymus Sac. DOLINDI RUOTOLI). *La Sacra Scrittura. Psicologia. Commento, Meditazioni.*

Et sequenti Feria V, die 14 eiusdem mensis et anni, sanctus D. N. Pius divina Providentia Papa XII in solita audientia Exe. D. Adressori Sancti Officii impertita relatum sibi Emorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, confirmavit et publicari iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 20 Novembris 1940.

Romulus Pantanetti, *Supremae S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.*

II

DECRETUM

DE DIRECTA INSONITIUM OCCISIONE EX MANDATO AUCTORITATIS PUBLICAE PERAGENDA.

Quaesitum est ab hac Suprema Sacra Congregatione: « Num licitum sit, ex mandato auctoritatis publicae, directe occidere eos qui, quamvis nullum crimen morte dignum commiserint, tamen ob defectus psychicos vel physicos nationi prodere iam non valeant, eaque potius gravare eiusque vigori ac robori obstare censentur ».

354

Acta Apostolicae Sedis - Commentarium Officiale

In generali consensu Supremae Sacrae Congregationis Sancti Officii, habito feria IV, die 27 Novembris 1940, Emi ac Revmi DD. Cardinales rebus fidei ac morum tutandis praepositi, audito RR. DD. Consultorum voto, respondendum manderunt:

Negative, cum sit iuri naturae ac divino positivo contrarium.

Et sequenti die dominica, 1 Decembris eiusdem anni, sanctus D. N. Pius divina Providentia Papa XII, in solita audientia Exe. D. Adressori S. Officii impertita, hanc relatum sibi Emorum Patrum resolutionem approbavit, confirmavit et publicari iussit.

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 2 Decembris 1940.

Romulus Pantanetti, *Supremae S. Congr. S. Officii Notarius.*

III

SUBMISSIONIS NOTIFICATIO

Sac. Dolindus Ruotolo (Dain Cohenel) humiliter se subiecit decreto Sancti Officii diei 13 Novembris 1940, quo damnatum et in Indicem Librorum prohibitorum insertum est opus ab eo scriptum, cui titulus: « La Sacra Scrittura. Psicologia. Commento, Meditazioni ».

Datum Romae, ex Aedibus Sancti Officii, die 6 Decembris 1940.

These Workers Don't Strike

How One Firm Has Solved Its Labor-Relations Problem

WHILE other California manufacturers form employers' councils and rage over the Wagner Act, the Paraffine Companies, Inc., is pushing ahead with a labor-relations program at its big Emeryville plant which has set a new high in industrial operation and has tied the company, its employees and eighteen CIO and AFL unions into a group that behaves as peacefully as Ferdinand.

The unique feature of the program is the Labor Relations College that Paraffine President W. H. Lowe opened last spring. Largest labor-relations school the world has ever seen—with more than 200 in the first class—the college is also the first of its type to be open to factory bosses and union officials. Labor spokesmen, capitalists, newspaper editors and college professors are included in the faculty. Each teaches a subject on which he is a recognized authority. A special effort is made to show in theory and practice what can be done in working out coöperation between labor and company management.

Behind the new school is Mr. Lowe's thesis that education breeds tolerance and tolerance breeds amity. The surprising brotherly love among Pabco and the eighteen CIO and AFL unions is explained by Vice-President R. H. Shainwald, the company's executive representative at all meetings with labor, in these words: "We have set an example of fair dealing. The unions have responded in kind." The preamble to Pabco's agreements with the various unions reads: "The general purpose of this agreement is, in the mutual interests of the signatory company and the signatory union, to provide for the operation of the plant of the Paraffine Companies, Inc., Emeryville, California, under methods which will further, to the fullest extent possible, the safety and general welfare of the employees, economy of operation, quality and quantity of output, cleanliness of plant and protection of property. It is recognized by this agreement to be the duty of the company and the union to coöperate fully, individually and collectively, for the advancement of said conditions."

The present college is a natural outgrowth of the general attitude of Pabco. When in 1937, a CIO business agent asked that the Paraffine Companies, Inc., permit unionization of its 1,500 Emeryville employees, President Lowe was more amused than irritated. For years wages at Emeryville had been as high as any in the industry; paid vacations, company-paid group insurance, free medical attention and liberal social privileges had been a standard part of the Pabco policies. In half a century, there had been almost no labor

trouble. But Lowe was willing to see what his workers thought. A secret ballot showed 55 percent of the Emeryville employees voting in favor of an outside union. Unlike the majority of manufacturers who have faced similar problems, Lowe believed the vote was caused, not by employees' ingratitude and disloyalty, but by failure of the company to sell its workers on its methods.

So the company union was dissolved. In its place came, gradually, the eighteen CIO and AFL groups. Jurisdictional strikes threatened. Lowe called in union leaders. "The company has been fair with you," he declared. "Why not be fair with us? Why not select an arbitrator to iron out your disputes?"

The union heads agreed. H. W. von Morpurgo, industrial-relations director for Pabco, was chosen for the job. There was no strike—and there has been none during the three years since outside unions began to take over. And this, remember, in the San Francisco Bay region, where strikes have become almost the favorite outdoor sport.

The Pabco peace is particularly notable in view of the fact that some of the 1,500 men at the Emeryville plant are occasionally transferred for short periods from one department to another. Lowe explained to union officials who objected to the practice that his company wanted only to keep its men employed. Today, Pabco is one of the few places in the country where AFL men can step into CIO jobs without switching union buttons.

When the outside unions came in, Pabco transferred supervision of personnel from the manufacturing division to the president's office. An executive was assigned to spend his time walking through the plant, talking with the men, learning what they thought, how they worked, what they did, how they felt about company policies. Appeals to the highest executives, in the case of complaints, were made easy. A model paymaster plan was adopted which permitted the men to draw their pay during the last shift of the period for which the pay was due. The agreements with the various unions are what labor calls "Class A," meaning they are models that the unions hope other manufacturers will copy. Although Pabco wages already were high, the new agreements have boosted them. A closed shop has been declared. Methods for arbitrating disputes inexpensively have been set up.

It was the closed-shop idea that gave other San Francisco Bay area employers the jitters. They complained bitterly that Pabco was making it necessary for

them either to bow to union pressure or fight harder than ever before. Mr. Lowe retorted that Pabco was deciding on the closed shop in order to give the unions a chance to carry their share of responsibility for the company's success.

The unions did assume their share of responsibility—and promptly. Labor papers from Nashville to Seattle began to pour out blessings upon Pabco and all its works—and included in those blessings were frequent exhortations to "Buy Pabco! You can recognize the products by the easily identified brand mark." From The East Bay Labor Journal came the pronouncement:

Pabco is competing with some big international concerns who pay 45 to 50 cents an hour, whereas Pabco pays from 85 cents to \$1 an hour for non-craft jobs. Work at Pabco is also steady. Pabco's personnel policies are the most liberal in the world and their contracts with the unions have all of organized labor's pet clauses.

It is up to organized labor to keep these fine conditions and high standards of living. It can only be done by buying Pabco products and favoring them against all chisellers. To keep the American standard of living high, insist on Pabco products.

One union group prevailed on a nearby city to purchase Pabco flooring for its new buildings. Another union sponsored a direct-mail campaign advertising Pabco products on a national scale. A third notified merchants in the Bay region that Pabco had 1,500 employees and an annual payroll in excess of \$3,000,000, and intimated that the merchants would be helping themselves if they stocked Pabco products. When the California Highway Commission needed paint for the state roads, a union delegation got the order for Pabco.

To give the rank and file the same general training in company policies that is now being given bosses and union heads in the Labor Relations College, Pabco has issued "The Book of Knowledge" and "Jim Sez." The first of these came out as separate sheets, published weekly in pairs, which were distributed to all employees. One sheet of each pair told of institutional matters—how Pabco money is spent, how wages compare with those paid by competitors, why employer-employee coöperation is necessary to make the company successful and to maintain paying jobs. The second sheet told how and of what Pabco products are made. Frequently, both sheets were slanted toward the thought that Pabco employees, as much as Pabco executives, are salesmen for the company. To inspire special interest in the series, contest questionnaires based on "The Book of Knowledge" were given each employee, and prizes totaling \$250 were paid for the best answers. When the seventy-one advertisements had all been published, they were bound into a looseleaf cover and a copy was presented to every employee.

"Jim Sez" played a slightly different role. More than 100 cartoons went into the spiral-bound book, to

make up a playlet in the course of which Jim, an old employee, took Bud, a new employee, through the Emeryville plant and showed him exactly how the company's policies worked. In its complete form, "Jim Sez" makes an exhaustive and entertaining study in plant management and personnel relations.

The predecessor of the new Labor Relations College came into being while "The Book of Knowledge" was going the rounds in 1938. One class—a small one designed to train shop foremen in handling men—attracted attention. A second class, taught by two University of California professors, provided a three-months' course for Pabco union leaders. At the conclusion of the course, the degree of Bachelor of Labor Relations was conferred upon each graduate. The first set of graduates, twenty-five in all, was turned out in January, 1939.

Courses had hardly begun when a union business agent—an important lieutenant of Harry Bridges—telephoned from San Francisco. "We've heard about the school you're starting," he announced, "and we'd like to know if some of us can get in on it. We can? Then we'll be around!"

Since that first session, union leaders from outside Pabco have been at nearly every class. The entire cost of the earlier classes, like the cost of the present Labor Relations College, has been borne by the Paraffine Companies, Inc.

Have the Labor Relations College and the general program benefited the company financially? "Yes!" says Vice-President Shainwald emphatically, and adds that the use of "The Book of Knowledge" alone jumped labor efficiency 8 percent in one year and cut 20 percent, or about \$100,000, off the company's annual waste bill. Absence of labor trouble has added money to the paychecks and profits of the employees and the company. Increased efficiency has meant lowered costs in spite of higher wages; the 1939 stockholders' report observed that since 1929 the selling prices of Pabco products have dropped 20 to 30 percent, while the base rate of pay has climbed 50 percent.

There is no reason, in the opinion of the Pabco management, why any company should not enjoy the same cordial relations with labor that the Paraffine Companies, Inc., has had. In a letter to an Oklahoma union official who had asked for advice on settling a strike, Vice-President Shainwald wrote: "I am quite sure that if you, representing the employee, and your employer, representing the company, could sit down with me in my office for an hour or two and learn what we have accomplished in our dealings with our employees, your differences would be easily settled without resorting to strikes, which are always costly to both sides and which lead always to a solution in the end which could have been had without the tremendous loss of income to both parties."

ARLEN MARSH

Washington Notes

Taxes Can Keep America Free

THE FIGHT we Americans are about to wage over the administration's tax bill probably will have more effect on the outcome of the war than the Battle of the Balkans. Our battlefields will be in the Capitol, on the air waves and in the press. Our weapons will be words. It will be our Thermopylae, nevertheless, and the odds against the defenders will be truly those of Thermopylae.

The Roosevelt administration has done some brave and audacious things, but never anything braver or more audacious than when it wrote the tax bill now under consideration by the House Ways and Means Committee. Chances for the bill's enactment precisely as written by Treasury experts and approved by the President are probably not better than one in a hundred. But there is a fair chance that its basic principle—sacrifice for national defense by citizens best able to pay and in proportion to their ability to pay—will be retained in the final vote by the House and Senate.

Whether this principle survives the various legislative processes through which the bill must pass will depend upon the willingness of the most fortunate among us to dig down deep into our pockets to buy weapons for the destruction of Hitlerism. The people who will be hardest hit by this legislation are the people who have the most influence with Congress. Unless they indicate their willingness to pay, Congress will not make them pay.

When the score is finally counted, it may well be found that ultimate outcome of the struggle between the dictatorships and the democracies was decided by the American people when they either consented to pay the price of national defense or refused to pay it. The time for decision is now.

The Treasury has sent to Congress a tax schedule designed to increase federal revenues nearly \$3,500,000,000 a year. This schedule lays heavy surtaxes on corporation incomes and on individual incomes in excess of \$2,000 a year. The object is threefold:

To put the defense program partly but not wholly on a pay-as-you-go basis.

To guard against a disastrous inflation.

To channel money that ordinarily would be saved or spent on non-essential luxuries into the Treasury and thence into the pockets of defense workers, many of whom are yesterday's unemployed.

Experts seem agreed that if we are to go all out for aid to Britain and for national defense, if we are really serious about stopping Hitler, we must tax ourselves for as much as the proposed legislation will produce. There is disagreement, however, about the proper way of getting the revenue. All sorts of alternative plans will be proposed to Congress. Most of them will call for lower taxes on incomes and higher taxes on sales. Republican members may even suggest a general sales tax. If they do, it will be in defiance of the fact, now widely known, that such a tax,

based primarily on expenditures for consumption goods, bears with disproportionate severity upon those least able to stand it—the poor.

The bill presented to Congress is not perfect from a social point of view. It retains some excise, or sales taxes. But the drafters of the bill have been careful to apply these excises only to non-essentials. They do not tax food, clothing and other goods and services which the poorest among us must have. They are laid on liquor, tobacco, gasoline and luxuries.

It is fair to say, I think, that the bill presents the most equitable plan ever officially proposed for paying the nation's bills. The rich and the well-to-do will pay through the nose. The poor will pay no more than they do now unless multiplication of employment opportunities gives them a chance to improve their condition and to buy more luxuries. Many lies will be told about this bill by its enemies. Some of them already are being told.

It is being said by members of Congress and repeated in the press—often innocently—that this is a sock-the-poor tax bill. That is exactly what it is not. The press associations, whose dispatches from Washington are supposed to be wholly unbiased, are falling head over heels for this misrepresentation. The United Press, for example, talks about "drastic income taxes on the little taxpayer." The Associated Press calls the bill "a drastic plan for collecting two to six times as much income tax from the taxpayer in the low and middle brackets." And from the AP comes the outright misstatement that the bill would impose "a tax rate of 16.5 percent on the lowest incomes."

What does the AP mean, lowest incomes? Except in the case of single wage earners, the bill does not affect anyone earning less than \$2,000 a year. And, because of exemptions, it will not increase the taxes of most families getting less than \$3,000. Incomes of \$2,000 to \$3,000 are not low in the U. S. A.—unfortunately. In fact, only one-tenth of all families and individuals in the country took in \$2,600 or more in the years 1935 and 1936, and the proportion has not changed much since then, even though the national income has increased from about \$60,000,000,000 to almost \$90,000,000,000.

The proposed tax bill is a sock-the-poor measure only if one considers most of the people in the upper-tenth income brackets poor and nine-tenths of all the people in a condition of sub-poverty.

The bill is most drastic in its application to the \$5,000 to \$10,000 incomes. That is why it will be so hard to push it through Congress. Representatives and Senators get salaries of \$10,000 a year. Most of them not only represent but identify themselves with the substantial people in their communities who also make \$10,000 a year or thereabouts. A few owe their seats to labor, organized or unorganized, but only a small proportion of them realize it. They are a part of what is miscalled the middle class. Actually it is the upper class, if class is related to income.

It is the class that populates and runs Congress. It is the class that will be tapped for sacrifices by the new tax rates. It is the class that must now decide whether it values its little luxuries more than the institutional luxury of freedom. We shall now see whether the so-called middle class can and will take it.

Washington

T. R. B.

Critics in a Circle

The Beautiful People, by William Saroyan. Lyceum Theatre, April 21, 1941.

IT SEEMS a useful function here in a journal like The New Republic to go on record as saying that both the dramatic critics and the occasion of voting on the award for 1941 are considerably above the impression sometimes produced among their newsheet readers, nothing like so trivial, toshy or zippy. Napoleon said there are rattles for all ages. It is only too natural, therefore, that the dramatic journalist, in his nursery capacity, or at least his ancillary servicing, should strive to please on various levels, and that he should labor to engage his editor, his editor's newspaper's advertiser, and the innocent ranges of his readers' interest, and lead them to attend quick words, mockeries, wisecracks, cheap defenses or instinctive grandeurs, as the case may be.

Once at a meeting of the Drama League, in its salad days, when you heard it spoken of, our celebrated and ubiquitous sculptor, Mr. George Grey Barnard, appeared and made a speech of which the text was, my friends I give you my word we are immortal. That was a promise indeed, as infinite as it was safe, space and eternity being what they are; and some of our reviewers' affirmations have a like violence and scope at times. At times they redound with nonsense, clichés, haste, or some sad and lame esthetics. (After all, the better part of what they must review is tripe or worse.) Nevertheless, I can defend our critics, I know, as capable of doing themselves a lively injustice, and as often at such times differing from themselves even more, perhaps, than they might from others—*nous sommes quelquefois aussi différents de nous-mêmes que des autres*. The majority of the critics, for all the occasion's coquetties, are dead serious about the voting.

At any rate, there was copious voting at the Drama Critics' Circle meeting, and plenty of remarks that apparently made less sense than the thought that lay behind them. And there was elected at length Miss Hellman's play for the prize-winner. Six votes went to the new Saroyan.

The committee, meanwhile, whose business it was to formulate the basis of this decision returned with, as I recall it, the statement that the award was made to "Watch on the Rhine" as a vital, eloquent and compassionate play about an American family suddenly awakened to the danger threatening its liberty. Upon the announcement of that comment, so inexact, oblique, or shall we say sweet-tempered, Mr. John Anderson, of The New York Journal and American, with that devotion of his to the theatre art and to the honesty and directness that underlie all art everywhere, immediately objected. Whereupon a number of us, defending that same proper hope, seconded his objection. The point of which is obvious. "Watch on the Rhine" rose and shone by its claim of being an anti-Nazi, or anti-Fascist, drama. In this theme as publicity lay a great deal of its appeal, and some of those who promoted its candidacy for the award regarded this anti-Nazism as one of the play's chief claims to importance.

The truth about the play is that it has many excellent qualities, but that there is no worthwhile statement of any family's awakening. This American family decides, with some degree of noble disgust, to help cover up the killing of

the Rumanian count and forward the cause of the commendable son-in-law, who is going back to rescue a friend from the Nazis pretty much as he would try to rescue him from any other hostile jailers anywhere, and then, if circumstances permit, he will continue the fight (vague at that, so far as concerns this luxurious American household—by no means our average household, as some of the accounts imply). Nothing is gained by this smooth omission of one of the chief sources of the appeal of "Watch on the Rhine"—though this is the side of the play where the dramatist has most failed to discover, or create, an imaginative image of the necessary power and significance. The state of things the battered hero of Miss Hellman's drama fights against is something anti-American, anti-Jewish, anti-anything we like; but let's say so flat out. "Watch on the Rhine" has many virtues, much to be praised, as we have all said some time ago; and one of the fine things to remark about it is that it can stand a full statement of the reasons for our interest and endorsement. Among these reasons is the element of timeliness in the subject matter, at a moment in our history when timeliness is highly important and, in so far as the play really comes off, is indicative of vigor.

I scarcely know what to say, just, as to the timeliness of Mr. Saroyan's play of "The Beautiful People," since time has grown so relative, and across all things eternity is spread in formulas so bright and in essence so impalpable. If we are going in for application to our time, "The Beautiful People" is to my mind far more pertinent than the other play. The final virtue, humanly speaking, of "Watch on the Rhine" reverts—from Broadway—to danger, courage, loyalty and the struggle against tyranny. As to what the final virtue of "The Beautiful People" is, we know, as St. Augustine said of God, if you don't ask us. The everlasting Franciscan is there: love, freedom and finding your own song, intensity and simplicity—the true ghost of our life walking forever under the trees.

The plot in Mr. Saroyan's play will annoy some people by its absence—for we are used to plots as plots go, stupidity and all. He no doubt defies the theatre requirements in not making us realize at the start, and from time to time, that the son blowing the cornet in New York, will return to the family nest at last, or at least that they all hope he will. The son does, so what more could you ask? There is so much explanation in the usual run of plays and their plots and so little to explain that the theme and action of a play like this should willingly be spared from the dotted plot-line. Or at the worst we might take a plot along with us to the theatre and mix our own, as it were.

Curiously enough Mr. Saroyan knows what the saints asked—what lovely inconsequence, what blessedness of consent for another's way of life as seen by that other himself, and what sum of our peace there may be in that will of God—which phrase is Dante: *in la sua volontade*—or shall we say in life's will? If it were not for the critics meeting there at the Algonquin, I should have liked to give to this transient, migratory review, a title involving the Golden Gate and those who look from this lovely play out beyond it.

A few places drag in the course of the scenes of "The Beautiful People," but not badly. Mr. Eugene Loring—hitherto of the ballet—as the literary son of fifteen, who is

writing—deliciously imagined—books of one word; Mr. Curtis Cooksey as the father; Mr. E. J. Ballantine, as the business man who on his travels has seen a kind of undomestic vision; and all the company in fact, do good jobs, thanks partly to a mad, free casting on the part of the author, who, as everybody reading the papers knows by now, also produced the play. (Expense and all.) Next week I will write about Mr. Saroyan's directing. And meanwhile, for such shy theatre-goers as may be, there is the proverb Socrates liked to quote: To the feasts of the good the good come uninvited.

STARK YOUNG

Safari, So Good

THE ROAD TO ZANZIBAR" is purely a gag picture, in the main conception and in every inch of the way; and it is the funniest thing I have seen on the screen in years. Years. So many comedies now feel the need for a theme and a near-meaning, like have a good laugh and win a set of dishes too, or, uneasy lies the clown that wears a head. And so many of the few pictures made in the old free-comedy way never attain a minute of freedom from the laborious antic of a script that must be followed word-for-word by a group with an honorable training in old japes, willingness to the point of violence, and no idea of humor. But here is one that exists in a ponderously difficult medium and still has the free and happy air of the spontaneous, the best vein, the laughter shared and mounting.

There is nothing new here in the movie form. (The effect of commenting on the picture as from outside, the old break-through of the footlights, is merely given a little more imaginative play than usual; and the true phenomenon of it belongs to show business in general: two comedians without straight men happy in playing two straight men in search of a comic.) It is a Victor Schertzinger production for Paramount; it is done with care and over-all good timing, with the best professional set-work, lighting, scoring and photography in the world. They started with the idea of combining Bing Crosby and Bob Hope as two young Americans from the carnival time who can't agree through the story whether they are really stranded in Africa or about to take the continent over for three percent against the gross. Their problem is complicated by the police, two Brooklyn girls on safari, hostile natives, a couple of musical numbers and some stock shots Mrs. Martin Johnson brought back alive. This much might have been just a setting for Laurel and Hardy, or the track without the race.

Bob Hope is supposed to employ so many gagmen they are organizing a union, but anyway he selects the best and puts them over as a bright natural, the acknowledged master of the delayed take, a comic with the grace and surprise in action of eccentric dancing and a foolish innocence of face through which he can crack out a line like a mule-skinner. And Bing Crosby, an increasingly valuable movie property but indexed as a Voice, is already known in the radio and recording studios as Old Unbreakable, never bothered and never at a loss (when the drummer on his program dropped half his hardware in the middle of a key number, Bing just said like smoking a pipe in slippers, "Hold the phone, there's been a nasty accident" and carried over with laughter). Besides that, I believe him to be the first

artist in popular expression today—not just slang for its newness or to be different, but the kind of speech that is a kind of folk poetry, with its words of concision, edge and cocky elegance fitted to speech rhythms, so that they may run free to the point, musical and easy.

And so when these two came to "Zanzibar" they were hot and they were ready. Every bit of business led them to a new one, every new one led to some more new lines, and the laugh they found there set them off again. The film wasn't in work three days before the word went out that the two boys had taken over and were killing everybody including themselves. Just give them the general idea and show them where the audience is sitting, that's all they need. The laughs engendered are so many and near between that for once they can dispense with that frost on every blossom: But will the vast public understand what you *mean*? So for once two characters from show business are allowed to talk in character, and the public will get it as it will get anything it likes.

As to the word "gag"—and incidentally the process on which this show depends—I think it should be clear that the term applies to "Any device intended to elicit laughter, usually superimposed on the main body of proceedings." It may be largely verbal—as when the boys are surrounded by hostile black men hideous with war paint, and try to act like nothing has happened: "Why, hello there," Bing says, advancing cheerily, "Who's got the dice?" It may be half and half, as when Hope is presented to a skeleton and shakes its hand absent-mindedly, murmuring: "Don't bother to get up." It may be action, a reversal in business, as in the wrestling bout with the gorilla, which Bing is able to distract by holding a lighted match through the bars (the gorilla can't resist dropping Hope and running over to blow it out), and then when Hope gets going and begins to take falls out of the gorilla he rushes over in sweat and confusion to blow the match out himself (sudden realization: "Did I do that?"). All they have to know is that Hope as the one called Fearless is scheduled to wrestle with a bear, a python, an octopus, as the newest Sensational Idea of his partner, and that the prop department has set up an enormous live octopus in a glass case, and they go to work on the thing for laughs (while Fearless is wrestling single-handed with the damn fish, what are those other six arms going to be doing, knitting sweaters?) until time to throw it away. They buy a fake diamond mine and sell it, later two fake maidens in distress and can't give them away, and are always one jump behind the sheriff, or local eight ball. But always talking fast.

Dorothy Lamour and Una Merkel are in the picture but have little to do, and that little is written and directed in such a set way that you know what windows the breeze is coming through. The merriment here is so knowing, veteran and kindly, so irreverent of all things encountered and straightway forgot, so happily infectious within its own strict demands of trouping, that Stark Young might see it and forgive my allusion to his own *commedia del' arte*. The boys are two zanies with the bit in their teeth and running away with everything not nailed down, and still kicking up new capers to their own continual surprise, like pulling the rabbit out of the hat and having to stuff it back out of sight because the damn thing already had a hat on.

OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

Japan will award a medal and an annuity of \$10.50 a month for life to every mother of twenty-five children. — *From The Lincoln (Nebraska) Star.*

It may well be that human beings are not the central and focal point in a democratic scheme of government. — *Theodore J. Krepes, Economic Adviser to the TNEC, in Monograph No. 7, "Measurement of the Social Performance of Business."*

"While we are in complete sympathy with the Negro, it is against the company policy to employ them as mechanics or aircraft workers," Mr. Kindelberger [president and general manager of North American Aviation, Inc.] said. — *A release by the NAACP quoting a story in The Kansas City Star.*

It is only reasonable to assume that unless a determined effort is undertaken to prevent increased wages, we will suffer from inflation, our worst economic disease. It takes away the most from those who have the least. — *Alfred P. Sloan Jr., General Motors chairman, addressing the Economic Club of Chicago, as reported in The New York Sun.*

Adolphe-Jean-Marie-François-Joseph-Hubert-Agapit, tenth Prince de Schwarzenberg, Landgrave Princier de Kleggau, Comte de Sulz and Duc de Kruman, arrived with his wife, Princess Hilda-Sophie-Marie-Adelaide-Wilhelmine de Luxem-

burg de Nassau, eldest sister of the Grand Duchess Charlotte of Luxemburg. Prince Adolphe insisted that he and his wife were Swiss citizens and bore no titles. He describes himself as a farmer. — *News item in The New York Herald Tribune.*

It's Fun to Own Them, Too

Only one joy transcends seeing precious gems, and that is wearing them, not self-consciously, not selfishly, but as a source of pleasure to others. — *Advertisement of Hodgson Kennard and Company in the Metropolitan Opera Program (Boston Series).*

World Première

At the Showboat, Shakespeare's "Tempest" opens tomorrow night for a three-week run. This elaborate production will bring the immortal lovers, Ariel and Caliban, to Seattle for the first time. — *From The University of Washington Daily.*

Sour-Grapes-of-Wrath Department

Mr. Wayne Andrews, who writes this book, is evidently a Vanderbilt-phobe. I was not surprised to learn, on investigation, that he is a very young man, that this is his first book, and that he is not listed in the Social Register. The Vanderbilt legend has a way of intruding itself on young men, who go to Harvard and such, who are society-conscious and not in the Book. — *From a book review by Amy Vanderbilt of "The Vanderbilt Legend," in The American Mercury.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column; \$1 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. — THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Vichy Government in England

SIR: It is now becoming clear even to the British that Hitler is not going to invade England. Why should he? Is it not obvious that Hitler's next objective is the conquest of South America? To achieve this, he needs not the military collapse, but the collaboration, of England and her navy. He needs to turn England, like France, into a semi-fascist state. As Hermann Rauschnig says in "The Redemption of Democracy": "The collapse [of Great Britain] is to be so engineered that groups other than those now in political control can still make a so-called compromise peace. A compromise peace would be a victory for Hitler—a victory of revolution."

If this is true, the United States needs to reexamine its foreign policy. It is not enough to continue the shipment of foodstuffs and munitions to the British Isles. We must act decisively to strengthen every progressive element in England. We must use the tremendous influence given us by the lease-lend bill to make certain that forces bent on resisting fascism to the utmost remain at the helm in Downing Street. The present composition of the British Cabinet is not reassuring. Labor has gained nothing since the appointment of Ernest Bevin. The Conservatives still form a dominant majority despite their pre-war efforts at appeasement.

A similar situation confronts us in the Far East. There the Chinese Minister of War, Ho Ying-chin, is a known appeaser of the Japanese and now threatens to split his country internally by ordering his armies against the Chinese communists.

We must insist that Chiang Kai-shek remove such men as General Ho from positions of power.

Spokesmen for the administration have by inference accused

the American public of not taking the fascist threat to our liberties seriously enough. There is evidence that the administration itself is somewhat remiss. We need both a bolder and a more democratic diplomacy, and we need it now. For if we continue our present policies and the Axis intensifies its pressure, we may wake up some day to find that England and China have signed a negotiated peace. Then we shall know what isolation really means.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

VICTOR SHOWERS

The Schools and Defense

SIR: I have read with a great deal of interest, and mounting blood pressure, your article "Training for Defense," in the April 21 number. Let me answer your criticisms of the vocational schools, particularly in New York State.

"Seventy percent of the vocational schools are located in eight states." — This is because the schools have been developed where there is a need for trained workers, in the communities where the manufacturing industries are located. In New York State, 143 schools are in operation in 101 communities, training workers in occupations essential to national defense. At present, more than 15,000 men are being trained for employment; more than 22,000 employees of defense industries are being improved in the skills and knowledges of their present positions.

"They have older curricular obligations." — Short-term, intensive courses to prepare men for defense occupations have been developed and are in use. These courses have been prepared with the close coöperation of technicians and craftsmen from industry.

"They cannot always simulate an atmosphere that encour-

ages good work habits."—Teachers in vocational schools are men who have had at least nine years' experience in their trade before they can become licensed. In addition, hundreds of experienced craftsmen have been released by industry to teach in these schools for the defense program. How could an atmosphere for good work habits be better accomplished?

"Their locally autonomous school boards are under pressure from a few craft unions which want to limit the labor supply."—Every vocational school in New York State which offers defense-training courses has an advisory board giving equal representation to employers and labor. The AFL and CIO have endorsed the program of the public schools in this effort.

The most significant point is that, as a result of the first six months of training, 8,819 men have been placed in employment in defense industries. It seems to me that such a program should be judged on these results, rather than the amount of money it is able to spend in a given time.

Albany, N. Y.

EDWARD H. LANG

[Mr. Lang contradicts us on one passing observation—the degree to which a school can encourage special students in voluntary, non-paid training to form good work habits. In noting that "excess" youth exists where the vocational schools are not, that certain craft unions are exerting pressure, or that community-supported schools are obligated to their regular students, we stated simple facts, without placing any blame upon the educators. The New Republic does not minimize the existing facilities. Our point was that we still have millions of idle young hands that should be trained, and that rapid expansion of defense training could be made wisely and with little disruption through the NYA.—THE EDITORS]

Britain's Sea Power

SIR: Dr. Alfred Vagts, in your March 31 issue, has been good enough to dissect my "Anatomy of British Sea Power," and has been disappointed at the absence of certain elements which were never intended to be there. "Dr. Marder has not written half of the story of the harmonization of the relations between the English and American navies." True, but Dr. Marder, writing a history of British naval policy, was legitimately concerned only with the British side of Anglo-American naval relations. On that side he claims to be reasonably complete. The American side is mentioned only where it has a direct bearing on British policy.

"He has written on the whole too much on the problem of the British navy and European diplomacy [a valid criticism were I writing "The Love Life of the Polyp," and not a "History of British Naval Policy in the Pre-Dreadnaught Era"] and still not enough to enable us to lay a finger definitely on the focal infection of Anglo-German relations [I was concerned here primarily with the role played by the Anglo-German naval rivalry in Anglo-German relations. See especially pages 288-301, 543-45. It was never my intention to write a history of Anglo-German relations]—and far from enough, for a satisfactory and valid explanation of its behavior, on this navy as a 'body politic' and a body social. Who rather than what was the British navy at that time? Where did its officers come from?" etc.

Mr. Vagts, who for some time has been interested in the social background of naval and military leaders, can't understand my failure to ride his hobbyhorse with him. The fact is that I have written on the *whys* and *wherefores* of the British navy, and not on the *whos*, because I did not consider the latter germane to my subject, and because it merits a separate study. Indeed, the English naval historian Michael Lewis recently published a 300-page work on "England's Sea-Officers." Mr. Vagts, relenting, is generous enough to describe my treatment of the origins of the dreadnaught as "good, if not definitive." Since,

as explained in the volume, I have examined every pertinent source on the subject, including all the hitherto inaccessible records of Sir John Fisher, the father of the dreadnaught policy, I am curious to know what Mr. Vagts could add to my account.

Mr. Vagts takes me to task for treating the subject "historically rather than philosophically." But the book *is* a history. It is a heavily factual survey of a field hitherto practically unexplored, and, in the case of controversial issues, such as the role of the armament interests, the Anglo-German naval rivalry and Fisher's revolutionary reforms, I have added a liberal dose of interpretation. For the rest, I have been content to show how and why the Royal Navy and British naval policy developed as they did. The book, I maintain, remains what it set out to be: "a reasonably complete study" of British naval policy in the pre-dreadnaught era.

Widener Library, Cambridge, Mass.

ARTHUR J. MARDER

SIR: As there will be many who share Dr. Marder's concept of history, perhaps a word of explanation is due. It is this reviewer's contention that the "who" of history is also a "why": that study of the personnel of armed forces helps to explain policies, even down to the choice of arms, in some cases better than "documents." Is Dr. Marder, who claims to have "examined every pertinent source," oblivious of the basic historiographical principle that what is not in the documents may still be in the world? Or does Dr. Marder think that the modern mass army, the *levee en masse*, might just as well have appeared in the frozen autocracy of old Austria as in the socioeconomic conditions of France during the Revolution? To my way of thinking, military and naval developments of all countries bear the marks of their backgrounds and such was certainly the opinion of the great military historians, like Max Jähns in his epochal work, unhappily never translated, on "Army Constitution and the Life of Nations."

No doubt Dr. Marder has done exactly what he set out to do, though his two titles go far beyond him, and my hope was merely to stimulate him and other able students—a few of whom now turn to military and naval history—to a broader and more ambitious formulation of their historical problems.

Princeton, N. J.

ALFRED VAGTS

Henry Luce's Century

SIR: It seems to me that in his essay on "The People's Century" in The New Republic for April 7, Max Lerner reviews and appraises Henry R. Luce's "The American Century" not so much upon the basis of its actual content as upon the basis of an evaluation previously made of the work of Luce as publisher and business leader. I submit that the language in "The American Century" points so strongly toward the hope of "the people's century" that Lerner is not warranted in challenging the genuineness of the democracy it espouses.

It's all right to be somewhat skeptical but it strikes me that in this instance Lerner comes close to saying, "There must be something wrong with this essay because it is written by an enormously successful publisher"—and that is going too far. At a time when we need more than ever before to emphasize our agreements and minimize our differences, it is amazing that a constructive critic like Lerner should not, in the case of Luce's earnest appeal, dwell mainly on the immensity of the area of agreement between them.

Ames, Iowa

JOHN A. VIEG

SIR: I tried not to prejudge Mr. Luce's words, and on re-reading both his article and mine I still hold to my interpretation and criticism. I kept my eye on Mr. Luce the writer and not Mr. Luce the publishing tycoon. I never said or came close to saying what Mr. Vieg imputes to me. Unfortunately Mr. Vieg does not indicate on what passages in my piece he

bases his judgment. I am all for sweetness and light where they can be had, and I am even willing to entertain the miracle of Mr. Luce's plumping for a "people's century"—but not when he is as explicit as he was in his statement in playing up the imperialist dollars and playing down the democratic dogma. Maybe the trouble with me is that I want my miracles to take the substantive form of words.

Williamstown, Mass.

MAX LERNER

Doctors and Draftees

SIR: One of the sadder aspects of the administration of the Selective Service Act has been the rejections by army officials, at induction centers, of draftees who had previously been pronounced physically fit by the doctors working for local boards. After having taken this first physical examination, I suspect that the reason for the army's dissatisfaction with the results is the appallingly careless attitude of the doctors who give it. I don't know about all the draft-board doctors, who, I understand, have volunteered their services for this work and are thus presumably concerned with aiding the national-defense program. I do know that a group of New York physicians who examined me and some seventy-five other draft eligibles at a hospital looked us over as coldly and superficially as if they had been grading dressed beef destined to be used in the manufacture of cheap sausages. The atmosphere at the hospital was so unfriendly that by the time most of us got out we felt as if we had just been punished for a particularly nasty crime.

I don't think this is fair to men likely to be drafted or, for that matter, to the army itself. I find it difficult to believe that the doctors who examined me really found out much about my health. One of them, for instance, who had the comparatively easy job of describing some of our identifying features to a nurse, told her that my eyes were blue, though they have been hazel as long as I can remember. He seemed offended when I pointed this out to him, and he finally said that it didn't matter what color my eyes were. Of course it didn't matter, as far as my qualifications for military service were involved, but it couldn't help making me uneasy about the reports of the other doctors, who were equally cursory in their inspection of somewhat more vital parts of my body.

New York City

W. P. D.

Little Mags, Now What?

SIR: Rarely have you given space to so fuzzy an editorial as "Little Mags, What Now?" in your March 31 issue. To speak of "little magazines" as a class of things, like bath salts with slightly different scents, might have been justified in Paris in 1925. Today, however, when literary publications range in circulation from 100 to 5,000 copies, in contributors from hopeless scribblers to the most skillful living writers; when there is the widest diversity in policy, purpose, size, quality of printing, payment of authors and so on—how can you corral them and brand them alike and study them for herd characteristics?

There can therefore be nothing valid in your generalization that these publications "represent a tendency away from social realism toward the unfettered imagination and the unconventional metaphor, toward the private dream and the walking nightmare." The sentences you used for illustration—from *View* and the *Capricorn Press*—have no counterparts in most of the other magazines mentioned on the page. You might as well have quoted Ezra Pound in an effort to prove that modern poets admire Il Duce.

Many readers will gather from the editorial that you think editors are responsible for the fading of "social realism," and could check it if they wanted to. But obviously no literary editor can commission creative writing to suit his social beliefs after the manner of an economic or political editor commis-

sioning articles on current affairs. He must be content to select the best written and most interesting manuscripts submitted, taking special pleasure in occasional poems and stories which are close to his own views: the two poems in your March 31 issue, both excellent, though lacking in "social realism," suggest that your literary editor knows what I mean. You neglected to say that, if fewer poems and stories are revealing an awareness of social questions (at least on the surface), the editors may have less part in the tendency than the writers and the times. Also, that a partial retreat from "social realism" does not necessarily or usually mean succumbing to walking nightmares.

Finally, your remark about "generous angels" hovering over the magazines should not apply to *Accent*, which pays printers and contributors without benefit of subsidy.

Urbana, Ill.

KERKER QUINN, Editor, *Accent*

SIR: I want to thank you for the admirable "Little Mags, What Now?" With the passing of Zabel's commentaries on periodicals which used to appear in *Poetry*, it is easy to miss new magazines below the publicity of *The Kenyon Review* and *Partisan Review*, and you will do a service to your "provincial" readers by giving us from time to time a similar guide. The current piece has been of immediate use to me in interesting our university library in subscribing to the current *Little Mags* and in buying up files of the eminent defunct.

Iowa City, Iowa

AUSTIN WARREN

From The New Republic Mail Bag

J. Knowles Robbins of St. Louis sends us a "manifesto by French intellectuals," which he says was smuggled across the French border. France, these men write, "is that vast multitude of betrayed and oppressed who suffer and protest everywhere around us: of those who do not accept a dishonorable peace, who do not accept a government whose activities further the policy of the conqueror. . . ." Mr. Robbins adds that "the spirit of Verdun, the Somme and the Marne is not dead."

Joseph Lewis of Purdys, New York, thinks Tom Paine wrote not only for the soldiers at Valley Forge but for us when he said, "Tyranny, like hell, is not easily conquered; yet we have this consolation with us, that the harder the conflict, the more glorious the triumph." . . . Harvey Lebrum of Chapel Hill, North Carolina, says we are in the war, but with our hands tied and eyes averted. "By facing the realities . . . and openly declaring war on Hitlerism to the death, we shall raise the morale of the conquered and the still struggling." . . . Mrs. Ella A. Walker of Oberlin, Ohio, believes that we must demand peace terms, and asks if ending of discrimination against Negroes in our army and the freeing of India would not "persuade the oppressed of Europe that it is a new world we are building."

Our editorial, "To Avoid Strikes" (*The New Republic*, March 24), is censured by Karl Alexander, New York City, who says that "if Russia had Ford, Grace and Stettinius, rest assured that country would have been in a position today to talk Turkey to Hitler." The idea is not that he wants to transport these gentlemen to the steppes, a plan against which we have never expressed opposition, but that Mr. Alexander wants us to quit picking on the dollar-a-year men. Ruth Haefner of Portland, Oregon, on the other hand, liked this piece. Virginia Jane Wood of Alderson, West Virginia, writes that our "stand for labor has long ago ceased to be funny," and assures us that "everyone is getting just a little fed up with the demands of American labor." No one is worrying about the teachers who get \$125 a month or the stenographer who makes \$60, she says.

Special courses for North American teachers and students will be given at the summer session of the University of Chile, Santiago. For information write to the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York City.

Shelley Plain

THERE can be no doubt that this is the biography to which we must now turn for our best knowledge of Shelley. In point of information, Professor White's book¹ supersedes the two long works which have hitherto been standard—Dowden's of 1886 and Peck's of 1927, each in itself a formidable job. Where Dowden had access to a hundred and fifty Shelley letters, Professor White has been able to work with no less than six hundred; he has also had the advantage of many other documents available to neither Dowden nor Peck; of these perhaps the most important are the true texts of certain letters of Shelley to Hogg, previously published in falsified form, and the letters of Mary Shelley to Hogg which show that Mary, with Shelley's glad consent, planned to accept Hogg as her lover, though later she had a revulsion of feeling which lasted for the rest of her very respectable life.

Then, in point of manner, Professor White surpasses his predecessors. Dowden's manner is not always so bad as it can be, but it can be very bad in its occasional coyness and piousness; and Peck can be sometimes heavily judicial, sometimes supercilious. But Professor White is wholly at ease with his difficult subject; he writes of Shelley with affection, as he should, but never with apology; his style is clear, simple and grave.

Professor White's book is not so large as at first it seems, for its notes run to nearly three hundred pages, its index to half as much as that, and it is printed in very full type. Still, its text is somewhat longer than Dowden's and a good deal longer than Peck's and the question will naturally be asked whether this very large and laborious new biography gives us a new Shelley.

In one sense it does not. With all the additions, the old proportions remain much the same. There is still the early Shelley of rigid principle, boundless hope and precipitant action, and still the later Shelley of suffering, despair and the quest for death. To those who are already well disposed to Shelley, what Professor White adds in the way of new evidence or what he adds in the way of new argument from old evidence may intensify but it can scarcely change the familiar picture. Shelley's failure of sensibility in agreeing to Mary's arrangement with Hogg, that facetious buck, cannot please us, but it certainly fails to alter materially our old notions of the gracelessness of some of Shelley's youthful actions, which, of course, must always be viewed in the light of his later delicacy. On the other hand, more knowledge of the relations between Shelley and Godwin can deepen, but can scarcely initiate, our respect for Shelley's generosity and firm manliness; and though Professor White's treatment of the so-called Hoppner scandal—in which it was charged by a disgruntled servant that Shelley's "Neapolitan ward," an infant girl he had adopted, was really his daughter by Claire Claremont—is certainly better than Dowden's or Peck's and does indeed seem to clear Shelley, this too does little to revise our former feelings.

Yet in another sense we do get a new Shelley from Professor White, if not so much from any new material he

lays before us, then from his strict sense of fact and moral justness. His Shelley is less spritelike and more substantial, much more really related to things and events than the prevailing legend conceives. For example, in a biographical sketch of Shelley which appears in a very good college anthology of the romantic poets, we get this account of Shelley in Ireland: "... Shelley philosophized on the immediate remodeling of the world. [He and Harriet] went to Ireland, where Shelley, intending to settle the Irish question on the principles of Brotherly Love and Universal Tolerance, printed an 'Address to the Irish People.' Not immediately succeeding, Shelley returned after seven weeks." Well, Shelley was often impractical to the point of absurdity, but he was not so absurd as all this. The summary is no doubt based on Dowden or Peck, neither of whom encourages the supercilious view but both of whom permit it. But after reading Professor White's long and very circumstantial account of the Dublin adventure we cannot question the fact that Shelley was reasonably, if vainly, taking part in an actual, if weak, political movement with which he had full and complex relations, and that if absurdity is to be found anywhere, it is in the practical people who were creating the contradictions in Irish libertarian politics and not in the author of the very sensible "Address."

And so, in countless instances, Professor White gives us a Shelley who can be neither so vulgarly despised nor so vulgarly adored as, by some, he has been; he makes the Shelley of the concocted fancy-portraits unacceptable, and he allows us, in a double sense, to see Shelley plain. I have said that this is a new Shelley, but it is, of course, the Shelley of Professor Carl Grabo in his admirable "The Magic Plant," and of all serious critics who do not allow doctrine to becloud judgment. But Professor Grabo's book is interpretative and only incidentally biographical, and because it is Shelley's life, more than anything else, that has hindered the understanding of his work, a biography like Professor White's is necessary not only for historical but for critical completeness.

The life of Shelley is best described as that of an ineffectual angel. Like every Shelleyan, Professor White hates that phrase of Arnold's, but it is really remarkably exact, although perception of its accuracy must depend on a knowledge of the nature of angels. For with angels there is no willing without effect, so that an ineffectual angel is a kind of paradox. And in his youth Shelley conceived himself to be an angel; his early rationalism was not merely Godwinian theory but something that always made Godwin nervous—a certainty that there was no distance at all between the perception of the good and its realization in actual fact, a certainty so deep that he did what no rationalist philosopher ever dared to do: he acted upon it in his own life. This might have issued in comedy—not "Nightmare Abbey" (a novel which, however, is no true measure of Peacock's understanding of his friend) but perhaps a play by Molière, who, preoccupied as he was with people of high and rigid principle, was always skirting tragedy. But Alceste the Misanthrope, an ineffectual angel, was luckier than Shelley, for the society he despised was more stable than Shelley's and if it would not submit to his correction, it could at least endure him; then too, Alceste was surrounded by loyal and understanding friends, while Shelley was besmirched, or

¹ Shelley, by Newman Ivey White. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 2 vols., 1,440 pages. \$12.50.

betrayed, or idealized, or misunderstood by those who lived upon his love and energy. As Shelley's short life went on, he recognized the nature of his own tragedy and longed for death as the Platonic way back to his angelic nature; he said of himself that he was "a Power/Girt round with weakness," which is but another way of phrasing the tragic paradox, "ineffectual angel."

But if Shelley was ineffectual as an angel, he was far from ineffectual as a man. His achievement is now obscured, for I cannot agree with Professor White that the esteem in which he is held is at present very high; the contrary, indeed, appears to be true. Except in so far as Shelley is difficult and symbolic, the poetic idiom of our day has not gone his way; Professor White in his summary of Shelley's influence mentions no modern poet who owes Shelley a debt. Yeats, to be sure, did write of him with admiration, but that was so long ago as 1900, and even then a note of reservation was apparent. Three notable critics in three generations—Arnold, More and Eliot—have helped create a tradition of hostility to Shelley and have hinted or declared, each from his own different orthodoxy, their doctrinal disapproval or disdain. The critics of the contemporary Left have no interest in him; his metaphysics can only stiffen them with scorn; his meliorism—for, contrary to common belief, he did not advocate revolution by force—can only enrage them; his complex and gentle moralism can only irritate them.

It would almost seem that in our day Shelley has been abandoned to the aspiring young, to whom his tragedy peculiarly belongs; or to the timidly yearning, charmed by his self-pity; or to the academic for whom his enormous reading provides an endless succession of problems in "influence"—and this, I think, is unjust. Not that I would agree with Professor White when he calls Shelley one of the four or five great English poets since Shakespeare; this is surely an excessive judgment, for the best of his work, while very fine, is of relatively small amount. It seems to me that Shelley's achievement is to be found in his whole education and development; it must not be looked for even in the rigorous selection of his perfect work but in his entire canon taken with all its failures, poetical and philosophical, and for its failures. The course of his philosophical growth is, I believe, his claim to greatness and to the attention of our generation.

Shelley's age offered to the man of large and systematic mind two opposed but almost equally dogmatic visions of the world. One was orthodox religion; the other was the orthodox materialism of ancient tradition raised to a new eminence. Shelley rejected religion in his earliest youth; he believed—with good reason—that it was connected with the maintenance of tyranny, and he believed—without good reason—that it had been conceived only to serve the ends of tyranny. From the materialistic philosophy which he then so passionately embraced, he expected man's liberation; he believed, with many others, that if the mind and will of an evil God were driven out of the scheme of things and in their place there was substituted a necessity by which all qualities and events, and mind itself, would be seen only as the result of strict physical determination, the way would be opened to the extirpation of human misery. The contradiction in this view is of course apparent and Shelley saw it early; he had accepted a universe which did

not allow the real existence of a creative human will and mind, which were, after all, the only possible instruments for turning chaos into order. He had, he found, inverted the fable of the frogs and exchanged King Stork for King Log—a strong and crafty deity for a dull and limiting abstraction. Freedom—and Shelley had in mind social, political freedom and not merely the theological concept of free will—was as far away as ever before.

Facing this contradiction, Shelley abandoned his early position and set out to create a new one. The effort of thought and study it cost him was truly heroic. Shelley is often spoken of as a man without tradition, but that is because his tradition is so wide that its limits cannot easily be seen; he ransacked the past for help and found it in Plato and in neo-platonism—but it is a mistake to stress this aspect of his thought which, it seems to me, served him largely as a metaphor—in Spinoza, in Berkeley and in innumerable others. And he found it in the scientists from Newton down; he would not have a "dead" world but he would not have a living world at the cost of the ascertainable facts; for Shelley, with most of the romantics, was passionately reverential of fact, though, like them, realistic enough to include under this head the mental fact as well as the physical. The problem of the nature of mind and its place in the universe was so greatly pressing that he scarcely ever finished the metaphysical, psychological and moral treatises he began in prose of extraordinary clarity and beauty; and no doubt the pressure of the problem upon him accounts for what must seem to many the often unrealized quality of his verse. In the course of his efforts he came upon many insights into the nature of man and mind which have yet to be comprehended: a good case, for example, might be made for his having foreshadowed many of the essentials of Freud.

The manner in which Shelley solved his problem of mind and matter will not now seem so original as in its time it actually was. There are elements in it of what we should now call Kantianism, though if he read Kant at all it was not until after his own ideas were formed. There are also Hegelian elements. Shelley, however, was a poet, and while he often expressed his ideas in the most difficult symbolism, he had before his eyes a practical social reality; when he constructed his complex world in which mind, conforming to its own laws, is as real as matter, and in which mind and matter interact in a kind of life-giving struggle, the picture is far more alive and tangible and dramatic than any academic philosopher could make it.

It is a mark of virtue of Professor White's biography that, though it evades nothing of what is unattractive in Shelley's life, it is conceived as the history of a man whose greatness was his tragedy. It would be too much to say of Shelley that he was, in the ordinary sense of the word, a great teacher. He often fumbled and he was often extravagant and the religious orthodoxy and the radical-materialistic orthodoxy will, on these grounds, always seek to dismiss him. But the fact is that neither the religious orthodoxy, however refurbished, nor the materialistic orthodoxy, however tough, is going to serve our turn. Clearly the alternative is not that Shelley will serve our turn; for all his dreams, he was no savior; but far more than either of the orthodoxies he rejected, Shelley points to our own future.

LIONEL TRILLING

Books in Review

Poets and Prophets

ARCHIBALD MACLEISH is among the writers now being violently attacked for having said that this country must change in the crisis or go under. In that attack I have no wish to join, since I share his feeling of present danger and agree with many of the ideas for which he is being condemned. But I do feel that he has been making one serious error. For the best motives, he has been exaggerating the political importance of intellectuals in general and poets in particular.

The argument he presents in recent essays like "Poetry and the Public World," "In Challenge, Not Defense," "The Irresponsibles" and "The American Cause"¹ runs somewhat as follows: We are faced with a crisis that is not of the hands but of the heart and mind. Certain classes and conditions of men are revolting against the inherited culture of the West, and against all cultural standards. What they profess is a negative faith in obedience, discipline and brutality, but it is a faith nevertheless, and it can be conquered only by "a stronger faith, a more resisting ardor." Such faith and ardor can be supplied only by poetry, which in times like these "becomes again the one deliverer of the people." Yet the poets and the intellectuals in general are failing to perform their function in society. They are attached to ideals of impersonal science and impartial art that prevent them from taking part in the struggle, even though their own lives are at stake. And MacLeish exhorts each of them to "take the weapon of his words and carry it to the barricades of intellectual warfare, to the storming of belief, the fortifying of conviction."

But his speech to the writers of the nation—his public speech—can also be interpreted in private or biographical terms. We know that MacLeish was profoundly shaken by the fall of France. It was not merely his former home that was being occupied by the enemy, his friends and associates who were being carried off as prisoners: it was his whole cultural tradition, more French than English, that was being violently overthrown. And he did not merely say like many others that the forces by which France had been divided and destroyed were active in this country also; he felt those forces in his bones; he feared and hated them with his whole being. It was true that America had the physical strength to resist them, but it lacked the will to resist, having refused even to admit that it was endangered. In this spiritual crisis, MacLeish sought refuge in poetry, which now seemed even more important to him than in the days when he believed that it was worthy of a whole man's lifelong devotion. Once he had thought of it as reigning supreme in a world of its own, separate from the world of action; but now he pictured it as a ruling force in that other world as well, "the one deliverer of the people."

The trouble with both his public speech and the private

¹ All these essays except the last are included in "A Time to Speak: The Selected Prose of Archibald MacLeish" (Houghton Mifflin, 210 pages, \$2.75). "The American Cause" is published separately (Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 43 pages, \$1).

emotions behind it is that poetry is incapable of performing the quasi-religious functions he asks it to assume. Poets are not saviors or even prophets, and their writing is something less than scripture, though it may also at times be something more. Poetry is an art, as MacLeish himself insisted in 1939. And of art he said that it "is not a technique for extracting truth. . . . Art is an organization of experience in terms of experience, the purpose of which is the recognition of experience." In other words, poets can recreate the events of today and yesterday, but they cannot create tomorrow. If they feel an experience deeply, they can find the words to express it: that is their profession. If the experience has also been felt by others, the poetic statement of it can become a force that will help to change society. If it is felt by the poets alone, the statement is likely to go unheard. And if it is not really felt even by the poets; if it is merely something they are exhorted or exhort themselves to feel, then their voices squeak and their words become prose or bombast.

MacLeish has been asking poets to transcend the limits of their art as defined by himself. In the midst of the greatest crisis since the Civil War, he finds the nation in a state of bewilderment and apathy. He urges the poets to transform this apathy into action. But whatever the disease of the will from which the rest of the nation suffers, the poets have also been infected by it. They can describe the disease and its results in terrifying images—that is what many of them are now doing—but they cannot cure it or create a new religion. As MacLeish said in 1939, "Poetry, however some of its practitioners may talk of it, is not a magical art, and poets, like others, must understand before they can create understanding."

And the intellectuals in general—the men and women he addresses in "The Irresponsibles"—are no more able than the poets to save the country by their unaided efforts. He asks the question, "Why did we, scholars and writers in America in this time . . . not fight against this danger while the weapons we used best—the weapons of ideas and words—could still be used against it?" The answer that springs to one's mind is that many of us, including MacLeish himself, did fight the danger with precisely those weapons. Hundreds of writers and scholars, by no means a contemptible minority, spent their time writing articles and editorials against fascism, working with committees against fascism, helping the Spanish Republic, raising money for the refugees from fascism, drawing up and signing petitions, speaking in smoky rooms and big drafty auditoriums, doing their best and finding that it was not enough. They found, moreover, that the liberals were rich in sympathy but poor in performance, that the Communists stopped fighting fascism as soon as their activities became in the least embarrassing to Russia, and finally that scholars and writers as a class were politically powerless when separated from the broad public. Such are the lessons that many of them will remember from the 1930's. And today, when MacLeish exhorts them to the storming of beliefs and fortifying of convictions, he makes them think of a football coach between the halves

of a disastrous game, telling his team that even if the score is forty to nothing against them they can still win the game if they go out on the field and fight. The team knows better.

As a political force, the intellectuals have probably been defeated for this generation, but that is no reason for despairing of the world; it will go on without them. The militant faith for which MacLeish is seeking will some day be discovered or revived. That day is probably not far distant, considering that men do not usually exist for very long in a state of apathy and bewilderment. But it is not among writers and scholars that the faith is likely to be found, and indeed it may prove the opposite of everything they now desire. As for the poets, they will be privileged to write about it afterwards, when it has become a part of their experience.

MALCOLM COWLEY

Practical Democracy

New Adventures in Democracy: Practical Applications of the Democratic Idea, by Ordway Tead. New York: Whittlesey House. 224 pages. \$2.

ORDWAY TEAD'S "New Adventures in Democracy" sets out to discuss "the ways and means of giving practical effect to democratic attitudes and methods." Taking government of, by, and for the people as the democratic ideal, Mr. Tead contends that it can only be realized in the modern world by the development of a wide network of small representative organizations in which people can unite to voice their demands for varying types of education, working conditions, consumer products and public policy. This contention is backed by two main arguments: First, that the individual can no longer find security and happiness in a lone-wolf fight, but only by banding together with others who share his aims. To rampant individualists who fight the restraints of, for instance, union rulings, Mr. Tead commends the role of reformer and leader within, not without the group. Second, Mr. Tead argues that only by an inclusive, pyramided system of representative organizations can we check the mushroom growth of irresponsible pressure groups.

As a correlative to this, existing labor unions, student and parent groups, must be given voice in major policy determination if they are expected to rise above purely self-interested fights over wages, hours, etc. One of the most controversial applications of this idea is in the discussion of public service and the merit system. The job of making public service attractive and expanding the merit system depends, Mr. Tead believes, on the development of a strong community loyalty and sense of responsibility for the service. The problem is squarely faced here that this can only be accomplished if the employees are politically sympathetic to the broad aims of their administration.

The general background of ideas with which Mr. Tead deals has become, within the last few years, fairly familiar, but his conscientious application of these ideas to many different spheres of human activity is new and worth attention. The weak link in his plans lies perhaps in his depending too much on the hope of better leadership at all levels of group organization. No formula has yet been discovered for the production of the requisite leaders. EMILY CHENEY

Praise from Sir Hubert

Allenby: A Study in Greatness, by General Sir Archibald Wavell. New York: Oxford University Press. Index and maps. 312 pages. \$3.

A VOLUME as adroit as C. S. Forester's fictional study of Allenby, "The General," is a hard thing for anyone to write down. That he attempted to substitute fact for its brilliant fiction is perhaps not the least proof of the self-confidence of the commander of the British and Imperial Army of the Nile. It is only rather a pity that events in a more urgent theatre called him from the uncompleted task, as they recently summoned him from the completion of the Tripoli campaign.

For although the book ends with an apparently satisfactory climax to Allenby's great achievement, the destruction of the Turkish armies in Palestine, it is still quite clearly an unfinished work. Questions are left hanging which could only be cleared up in the summation. While commanding a corps in France with no very great success, Allenby was noted for his explosions of temper. In the Near East he mellowed. Was it achievement, or the fact that he was now an independent leader? Did the tendency continue? The clues lie in the unwritten portion of the book.

So do other, more important matters, especially the defense against Forester's charge that Allenby was the typical British bully-beef general, of whom someone remarked that in the mass they showed "an indecent exposure of jaw and an incredible lack of forehead." As far as that defense is developed, General Wavell seems to take the line that Allenby was not lacking in intellect, but that his peculiar character somehow pronounced a bill of divorcement between chin and pre-frontal area. Ordered to make a bull-headed attack that he knew would result in bloody loss, he executed the order to the fullest extent of his powers and without protest, because it was an order from higher authority, and his military character forbade him to run counter. The intelligence was revealed in giving no such orders himself.

This is ingenious and perhaps accurate reasoning, but the analysis of a character that could abdicate judgment in favor of discipline is wanting. It was not written, though the materials for it are built into much of the structure of the book—Allenby's interest in flowers and children, the picture of him turning from observations of the Turkish battle positions to count aberrant varieties of caterpillars.

The ensemble as presented does not altogether justify "A Study in Greatness," if only because the springs from which that greatness ran remain undiscovered. What was there to Allenby? A good mind, answers General Wavell, and character, ability to take advice and a physical courage so pronounced "that he never knew anything else existed," and which so impresses the biographer that he mentions it three separate times in exactly the same phrase.

But if this does not make a case of greatness, it does make an extremely good military biography, none the worse for being, as the author describes Allenby himself, deceptively conventional on first acquaintance. There is the old-fashioned description of the family in the shires, the so-familiar narrative of early days and people encountered—doubtless people interesting enough in their day, but to the average

reader only a parade of names as unimportant as the begats of Deuteronomy.

With a shock one realizes that with this chit-chat there is being mingled a painstaking account of the genesis of a military career—the origin and development of the ideas that flowered on the plains of Megiddo. General Wavell does not treat his old mentor as a stained-glass hero, either; he admits Allenby made mistakes and tells specifically what they were and how they came about. There is also some comment on the way things are often done in the British army, pretty astonishing from an officer in it, and pretty encouraging to those who know that the officer who made the comments now carries a great part of the burden of the war.

FLETCHER PRATT

Social Anatomy of Science

The Social Relations of Science, by J. G. Crowther. New York: The Macmillan Company. 665 pages. \$3.50.

TWO YEARS AGO, in "The Social Function of Science," the English physicist J. D. Bernal directed our attention to the serious gaps between "what science does" and "what science could do." To his impressively documented study we may now add this book by Mr. Crowther, whose recent studies of English and American men of science mark him as an exceptionally able interpreter of scientific trends and problems.

Believing that "the present crisis of civilization shows that science is a determining factor in the destiny of mankind," Mr. Crowther, in eighty-three concise chapters,

presents the history of science against the economic, social and political backgrounds which have so strongly influenced its development. A vast amount of information on the growth of technology is woven into a narrative whose purpose is to reveal the latent contradictions between the forward drive of scientific research and the heavy inertia of societies incapable of properly utilizing this research.

This theme is familiar enough by now, but Mr. Crowther's treatment of it—especially in his later chapters—is vigorous and timely. A comparison of the research problems in England, the United States and the USSR serves to illuminate the fundamental question of social planning on a large scale and to justify the author's eight-point theses on "the social responsibilities of scientists." These points range from the systematic exposure of all errors in science (such as the racialist dogmas) to the claim that "scientists, like others, cannot be above the battle, either in politics or in war."

HAROLD WARD

A Reader's List

QUEST, THE EVOLUTION OF A SCIENTIST, by Leopold Infeld (Doubleday, Doran, \$3). The collaborator of Albert Einstein, himself a fine scientist, tells the story of his life in a narrative that will rank among the better autobiographies of our time. The atmosphere of terror and anti-Semitism in the ghettos of twentieth-century Poland is lightened by innumerable episodes showing the author's intellectual development under great difficulties, and is enriched by his courageous defense of the values of science in a world "covered with sweat and with blood." Dr. Infeld

IN THE MAY-JUNE NUMBER OF—

partisan review

T. S. ELIOT: *The Dry Salvages*

The first major long poem by Mr. Eliot since "East Coker," published in *Partisan Review* last year.

ALLEN TATE: *The Season's Poetry*

An omnibus review, in which Mr. Tate considers the latest work of Gregory, Cummings, Pound, Jarrell, Berryman, O'Donnell, Moses, and Barnard.

OTHER FEATURES: Paul Goodman on D. W. Griffith, Clement Greenberg on Paul Klee, Karl Korsch on Lawrence Dennis's "Revolution," Dawn Powell on Arch Oboler's radioplays . . . poetry by W. R. Rodgers, David Schubert, Randall Jarrell. . . . "Two Morning Monologues," a story by Saul Bellow. . . . P. R., the P. E. N. Club, and the "Fight for Democracy"—an exchange of letters.

Special Frontispiece: The only known photographs (never before published) of Joan Miro's only murals, which were destroyed by the Germans in France last summer.

IS FASCISM A "NEW ORDER"?

Two detailed studies—totalling 40 pages—by James Burnham, author of the newly published *The Managerial Revolution*, and Dwight Macdonald, formerly an editor of *Fortune*.

FROM FRANCE: Uncensored Reports

Two remarkable documents, by writers who spent months in Nazi-occupied France: (1) a "Paris Letter" giving latest news on everything from Picasso to the Communist Party; (2) a series of first-hand interviews with soldiers, peasants, shopkeepers and minnettes during last June's mass exodus from Paris.

PARTISAN REVIEW,

45 Astor Place, New York City

Enclosed find \$1.00. Please send me one year (six issues) of *Partisan Review*. (Add 15 cents for Canada, 30 cents other foreign countries.) (Single copy: 25 cents.)

NAME.....

STREET.....

CITY..... STATE.....

gives us a lesson in the worth and integrity of the human spirit at a time when despair seems so easy.

MEDICINE AND HUMAN WELFARE, by Henry E. Sigerist (Yale University Press, \$2.50). Three scholarly essays on the history and significance of medicine by America's leading medical historian. Dr. Sigerist shows how deeply medicine is indebted to the dominant social character of the times, both for its theory and its practice. He reiterates his belief in the value of preventive medicine and in the increasing obligation of the physician to regard health as a social as well as an individual matter.

MUST WE GROW OLD? by Barclay Newman (Putnam's, \$2.50). A layman reviews the latest findings in our knowledge of the aging process, emphasizing the possibilities of a greatly increased life-span. The new medical specialty of "geriatrics" (study of the pathology of old age) is described, with particular attention to nutrition, the glands and cancer. A hopeful book for everyone over fifty, but to be read with caution. The lack of an index and of a short bibliography is unfortunate.

THE GANG'S ALL HERE, by Harvey Smith (Princeton University Press, \$2.50). What happens twenty-five years later to the graduates of a small mythical university. Mr. Smith, a Princeton man himself, gives the boys the once over and finds that, in general, they're either stuffed shirts or would like to be. Not calculated to leave you reverent toward an A.B. degree.

THAT NONE SHOULD DIE, by Frank G. Slaughter (Doubleday, Doran, \$2.75). An idealistic young surgeon finds plenty of dirty business among the men in white. Things get even more sordid under socialized medicine, but ethics and medicine finally get together under a system of health insurance. Some hospital romance here, and enough technical details even for those who can never hear enough of the next fellow's operation.

MERCY ISLAND, by Theodore Pratt (Knopf, \$2.50). Smooth excitement on a Florida key, called Mercy Island because a surgeon takes refuge there after a mercy killing. Four men and a woman are marooned on his remote hideout and presently a crocodile joins the party. The tension and the lush, tropical background are both OK. You'll stick close to this one till the end.

QUEST, by George Dibbern (Norton, \$3). The account of a man, a seaman-intellectual, discouraged out of the new Germany (where he left wife and children because after all he

had to find himself, thimble, thimble, who's got the thimble, etc.) and across the oceans in a thirty-two-foot boat to the South Seas. An odd case and a desperate venture, but the writing sounds like a translation of pumpnickel, and the Soul is talked out of existence.

THE ORDEAL OF THE FALCON, by Gösta Larsson (Vanguard, \$2.50). Sailors in a ship, with hardships, heat, hazings, hurricanes, etc. The author is a hard and conscientious worker; so is the reader.

Contributors

MAX WERNER is the author, among other books, of "The Military Strength of the Powers" (London and New York, 1939). His latest book, "Battle for the World: The Strategy and Diplomacy of the Second World War," has just been published by Modern Age Books.

RICHARD LEE STROUT is a Washington correspondent who has followed the TNEC since its inception.

SYLVIA TOWNSEND WARNER, the British novelist and poet, is the author of "Lolly Willowes," "Mr. Fortune's Maggot," "Opus 7" and "Summer Will Show." Her latest book is "The Cat's Cradle Book," published by the Viking Press.

PRESTON NEWMAN is an instructor in English at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Previously he had had two newspaper jobs and worked on wildlife conservation.

MICHAEL STRAIGHT recently resigned from the State Department and is now Washington Editor of The New Republic.

ARLEN MARSH writes: "I've done proofreading, advertising, sales promotion, bookkeeping, secretarial work, sales and credit correspondence and credit management." He has contributed to Barron's, Printers' Ink and Power Plant Engineering.

LIONEL TRILLING is a member of the English Department of Columbia University and the author of "Matthew Arnold."

EMILY CHENEY, a recent graduate of Bryn Mawr, is working in the editorial department of The New York Daily News.

FLETCHER PRATT is the military expert of The New York Post and contributes to The Saturday Evening Post and the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. Among his books are "The Navy: A History" and "Sea Power and Today's War."

HAROLD WARD's special interest is in the social implications of science and technology, a subject on which he contributes frequently to various periodicals.

REEZEMONT PARK
ARMONK, N. Y.
"A Country Estate in the Scenic Hills of Westchester County"
If you choose your hotel with the same care and taste as you would your home, visit this nearby resort. Exclusive, dignified, luxuriously furnished. All sport facilities. Excellent cuisine. Less than 1 hour from N. Y. C. Open All Year
Phone: Armonk Village 955

Birdland
OPEN ALL YEAR
Formerly Lewisohn's Estate. One hour from N. Y. 225 acres in fascinating hiking country. Tennis, Handball, Golf, Riding, Bicycles, Roller Skating, Library, Musical Recordings. Open Fireplaces. Congenial Atmosphere. Excellent Cuisine. Tel.: Highland Mills 7895.
Mgt. FANNIE GOLDBERG—CENTRAL VALLEY, N. Y.

ALYSSUM
"DAY CAMP FOR BOYS AND GIRLS"
Something entirely new in accommodations for parents and children. A luxurious hotel combined with a modern camp for boys and girls. 3-12. Cultural, occupational work.
Write for particulars, Box 7, Armonk, N. Y.

Exclusive ...
An Album of Prints of the War in Spain
10 1/2" x 13 1/2"
by Sim
31 Colorful Pictures—The loyalists' heroic struggle
Beautifully Portrayed \$1
THE LINCOLN BATTALION, E. Rolfe, \$1
POSTAGE FREE—U. S. A.
133 W. 44th St. New York, N. Y.
44th Street **BOOK FAIR**

UNEMPLOYMENT ITS PERMANENT CURE
Pamphlet. Shows how the average American can: (1) better his condition hundreds of dollars per year; (2) pay his defense bill; (3) stop our drift toward European fallacies. By: (4) retaining his liberties; (5) inaugurating a sound program to forever banish the waste and demoralization of involuntary idleness. Bookstands or postpaid 10c.
Promethean Press, 4 Bellevue Av., Binghamton, N. Y.

LANGUAGES
BARGAIN PHONOGRAPH COURSES. We sell, rent, purchase, exchange. All Makes. 20 different sets in French alone. Mail Orders. Request Booklet R.
LANGUAGE SERVICE, 18 East 41st St., N. Y. C.

WEARING APPAREL
MISS GOODMAN'S MODEL CLOTHES (Dresses Coats, Costumes). Wear the unmistakable stamp of quality and styling. You buy value, not labels. Hand-made Hats from \$5.00. 474 7th Avenue (36th St.). LA 4-4018.

LITERARY HELP
TREATISES, RESEARCH PAPERS, SPEECHES. Special Articles, reviews, promptly prepared to requirements of busy professionals. Our extensive experience available at moderate rates, with assurance of scholarly serviceable results. AUTHORS RESEARCH BUREAU, 516 Fifth Ave., New York.